

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF  
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1881.

---

ARTICLE I.

BY-WAYS IN THE LIFE OF LUTHER.

By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D.

There are by-ways in the life of every illustrious man which are not trodden by the popular biographer, and which the ordinary reader, of course, is not invited to traverse. Even if sometimes, they are pointed to by the historical sign board, it is certain that the reader will not meander through them if the writer does not go before.

Of this character are those numerous extraordinary deliverances from perils of various sorts and those remarkable preservations from the intrigues of his enemies, which so wonderfully diversify the life of Luther. Some of them may be found in the biographies, but I have thought that a collection of some of the most striking might make a By-Way,—a sort of untraveled, out of the way road, over which some admirers of the man might be pleased to walk.

I will not say that the Reformation was a miracle (*miraculum*) but nobody will deny that there was much in it that was wonderful (*mirabile, mirum*). The whole work was an unbroken chain of wonderful events. Luther himself piously regards the preservation of his life to a good old age as a wonder, (using

the German word *wunder*, by which he may mean *miracle*), for he says, "Hence in spite of popes and tyrants, God has preserved my life, which many look upon as a great *wonder* and which I also must confess to be so." Some of his defenders have used this word in different senses when speaking of his extraordinary career. Matthesius evidently uses it in the widest sense, when he says in his sermons on Luther, "His doctrine requires no new signs and wonders to establish it," but Seckendorff is a little more restrictive in observing that *miraculo simillimum est* that Luther should have lived through the seven years (from 1517 to 1523) when he almost alone was carrying on the work of the reformation, and John Gerhard says *mirumque profecto est* that he should have escaped so many perils.

The physical infirmities of this man in his youth, and the severe austerities of his maturer years, would almost naturally lead us to anticipate an early death. We know what his privations were when as a poor school boy, he was exposed to heat and rain and snow while singing in the streets for bread. His condition was not improved when he entered the cloister at Erfurt, where he was compelled to perform the lowest menial offices, besides begging in the city and practising the most painful self-mortifications, besides studying with unwearied diligence and living upon the most unsubstantial diet. All these and many more severe trials, bodily and mental, naturally affected his health most unfavorably.

After the publication of the Theses, blow upon blow fell upon him; one storm had scarcely abated when another howled around him with severer violence; the fiercest attacks were made upon his reputation, his work, his friends; citations to Rome, Augsburg and Worms, papal bulls and bans, alarms, anxieties, dejection, sicknesses and grievous spiritual temptations, all overwhelmed him with ceaseless frequency. The relentless wrath of the almost omnipotent papacy was let loose at once against his person, body and life; "the wretch was to be crushed" out of existence and no one dared to stand up in his defence. Would it have been a wonder if, at the reading of the citation to Rome, he would have been alarmed almost to death, for Rome was of all places the most to be dreaded by one who

had incurred the displeasure of the Pope? Any wonder if he had been rendered almost unconscious when the ban was declared and he was compelled to leave his friends and wander he knew not where? Any wonder if he had been struck with horror when he heard of Miltitz's arrival at Meissen, at which even the Elector himself was alarmed? Any wonder if his pious soul had been overwhelmed with anguish when the imperial summons to Worms was delivered to him, having good reason to fear that as in the case of Huss his safe conduct would not be observed, and he be left to the savage cruelty of any man who would choose to put him to death? True, he displayed an unexampled heroism which has been the world's admiration ever since, but he was a man still with a natural love of life instilled into him and a dread of violent, painful martyr death. The summons to Worms was as though he had heard the voice of the herald, Go to the place of execution, and be burned as Huss and Jerome of Prague were; be violently fastened to a stake; let combustible wood be piled up around you; let yourself be roasted to death; let your ferocious enemies commit all imaginable cruelties upon your body!

Superadded to these crushing sorrows, he had a weight of other bitter woes loaded heavily upon him. We are somewhat familiar with his pressing labors and the exhausting strain which was constantly put upon his mental and physical powers. All these demands upon a constitution naturally weak in his earlier years, told dangerously on his vital energies and he was not relieved from labor as years rolled on. Even as early as 1518 he writes to Spalatin, "I am not equal to the half of my work and it is constantly multiplying." In another letter he declines to write an exposition of certain portions of the Scriptures which he was requested to do, because of his engagements already sufficient to overwhelm any one man. His lectures, sermons, Bible commentaries, correspondence and the annoying, time consuming, visits of numerous friends at home and abroad, occupied all his days and the greater part of every night. In 1521, before the Diet of Worms, he says, "It is regarded as impossible by many that I should survive these oppressive labors. If I had had six years ago only the third part of my present

work to do, I would have succumbed under it." In 1517, he had more the appearance of a corpse than of a living man; and Mosellanus tells us that in 1519, you could count almost all the bones in his body, so utterly emaciated was he from hard study and anxiety. But just here we are called on to admire the *wonderful* in his career. In the midst of the heaviest storms howling round his head and groaning under the weight of accumulated sorrows, he is all at once reanimated, his bodily condition undergoes a most favorable change, he becomes cheerful, robust, vigorous, hopeful. He tells Emser that he regards this as a sign that God is with him. The portrait of him by Cranach in 1523, shows this physical improvement, but still he had but few days of exemption from the hardest kind of work. A wonder working Providence came to his relief and gave him strength to perform the severer labor which had been assigned to him, for he was destined to encounter still mightier foes and to endure still heavier burdens. Even if he had had nothing to do in the execution of his work than answering the enormous number of letters which came to him from all lands and from all ranks of society, it would have tasked the untiring energy of any one man. In 1529, he writes to Link, "I am daily overwhelmed with letters, so that my tables, benches, chairs, desks, window sills, chests, cupboards, and every thing else are crowded with them!" "I have no peace, for from all countries and from all sorts of people, questions, complaints, business matters and petitions are coming in thick upon me." No wonder that he sometimes complained that he had a bitter life of it and that he was subject to severe attacks of sickness. He sometimes fainted in the pulpit from sheer exhaustion and yet he did not spare himself but worked on as though he could endure everything.

The particulars of these frequent attacks of sickness, temptation and despondency are recorded in special monographs, but they cannot be more than alluded to here. The man who could use such language as the following concerning himself, must have been in a sad condition indeed. "Satan buffets me within, and has set on fire an anguish of mind, which exhausts the marrow from my bones and all strength from my body. I

would rather endure all corporeal torture, than to be martyred by the fiery darts of the devil."

#### STRATAGEMS AND INTRIGUES.

Although no man had more numerous and more powerful enemies, who, no doubt, would have sung a *Te Deum Laudamus* at his "taking off," yet I do not think it can be clearly shown that murderous attacks or stratagems were employed against him. There is no positive evidence that he was waylaid with the intent of murder or that poison was secretly prepared for him, although stories of this character are related. Whenever a suspicious looking stranger came to Wittenberg and desired to see Luther, it was immediately presumed by some of his friends that the stranger was a secret assassin and the report was soon spread abroad. It is said even that Luther himself suspected that on one occasion a guest had tried to poison him, and the popular saying was, *that no poison would harm him*, so often had it been tried upon him in vain. But there is good reason to believe that these were fallacious rumors.

But the question is a very different one when it is asked, whether his enemies did not conceive and plan measures for his abduction and perhaps for his death? What did Miltitz mean when he said, That the Cardinals would rather have paid ten thousand ducats than that this affair of Luther's should have begun? Was Europe at that time so morally uncorrupt, was Italy so free from bandits that not one could be found who for a thousand or two of guilders would poignard Luther in his house or on the streets of Wittenberg, or on the public highway? Was the Roman clergy too conscientious to take violently out of the way an accursed heretic? Did not the priests at Meissen openly declare that the man who would murder him would commit no sin? Who does not know that it is a universal principle of the papal leaders, "*Hæreticum de vita?*" It is not likely that the numerous bishops, prelates and priests who were embittered against Luther to the utmost degree, would all be so indifferent as not to have thought at all of abducting or cutting short his career by some more obvious means. On the other hand, it is more credible that all possible

measures should be conceived to rid the world of this pestilent heretic, even if there were no other ground for the belief than the diabolic opposition of these men and their well known ungodly principles on the treatment of heretics.

But whilst there is lack of positive proof that any direct attacks were made upon him, there is evidence enough that his enemies had matured secret plans for his destruction. Count Albert of Mansfeld must surely have been aware of an intrigue concocted by a man high in authority to strangle or drown Luther, and hence he warned his vicar John Lang in a letter, by no means to consent that Luther should leave Wittenberg on a certain occasion. Duke George, in a letter to Henry VIII of England, confesses that he would make short work with Luther if he could arrest him in the Ducal territory. The chancellor of the Duke in Pomerania (Olsnizer), wrote from Rome that the Roman Court had determined to entrap him by an Italian intrigue, which Luther interpreted into poison or assassination. He was warned by letters from Breslau against a murderer hired by the Polish bishops, whose appearance was minutely described to him. Even granting that all these stories and many more which Matthesius gives in Sermon XV, are founded on mere suspicion and that even the incident concerning the glass of wine which was brought to him at Worms, which he placed upon a bench and which broke to pieces before he drank the wine, is a mere fable, and whether the other fact, that the bottom of the glass of wine which he was about drinking in return to the toast of Eck, fell out, upon which he said, "This wine is either not wholesome or was not designed for me, is not to be attributed to natural causes. Granting all this, still it would be a *wonder* if the papal authorities had not designed various intrigues against the hated reformer. Must we not ascribe it to a higher power, that all their machinations to entrap him signally failed? May we not in a restricted sense apply to Luther the language of king Alphonsus of Arragon, when he was warned against a certain book, for its leaves and cover might be poisoned." God protects sovereigns because on their life, depends the welfare of kingdoms, countries and peoples." Just so may the friends of Luther speak of his won-

derful preservation from the toils of his persecutors! During his frequent journeys, he was exposed to constant perils in public houses, but he ate and drank whatever was called for without injury. Traveling noblemen and other high dignitaries carried their own trusted cooks and servants with them, but Luther could use no such precaution against stratagem, and yet escaped. The papists well enough knew the places through which he would pass and where he would stop, and spies could easily have betrayed his most secret excursions. How easily they might have bribed the keeper of a hostelry or a hired servant to mingle poison with his food! An overruling Providence prevented them. God had work for him to do and He would not allow the enemy to thwart His designs of mercy. They were especially anxious that he should not appear at Worms. They hoped that the Safe Conduct would not be observed and many influential dignitaries insisted upon its violation, but Heaven was on his side and brought the counsels of the ungodly to naught. And when he had got to Worms and was safely lodged, it would have been an easy matter to hire the stiletto of one of the numerous pariah servants in the retinue of the emperor, secretly to despatch him, for we have good authority for saying that during the continuance in Worms of the immense train of retainers in the emperor's service, there were three or four murders in the streets of Worms every night, and that upwards of one hundred persons were drowned, hung or stabbed. But Luther's friends were more apprehensive of poison as the easiest method of removing him, and in a celebrated city on Ash Wednesday of 1521, the following prayer was added to the litany: "That Thou wouldest be pleased to preserve Martin Luther, the immovable pillar of the Christian faith, who is shortly to appear in Worms, from all poison and Italian snares. Hear us, Good Lord."

#### PRESERVATION FROM THE PLAGUE.

Luther was frequently exposed to bodily perils, from which Heaven rescued him as the apple of His eye. Who does not know that during three terrible occurrences of the plague in Wittenberg, he gave the most illustrious proof of fearlessness of

death and of his heroic fidelity in the discharge of his pastoral duties to his flock smitten with an awful calamity. Even as early as 1516, the year before the Theses, when the plague raged fearfully in Wittenberg, he refused to leave at the urgent entreaty of his friend John Lang, but wrote, "The world would not perish, even though Dr. Martin did die. He has been called to Wittenberg and he is not permitted to flee anywhere else, his duty keeps him here and he hopes that God will deliver him from the terrors of death." When in 1527, the university was transferred to Jena on account of the plague and the Elector graciously advised him also to repair thither with his wife and children, yet he remained, although the pest entered his house and he daily visited those attacked. Great was the risk he ran at Augsburg and Leipzig. He says himself, "In my journey to Augsburg, it really seemed as if I were tempting God in exposing myself to such manifest perils," and of Leipzig, he says, "At Leipzig, I stood and disputed before a most dangerous assembly." At Worms, there was but one short step between him and death. Eck insisted upon his execution. Had the emperor been of the same mind with the majority of the ecclesiastical princes and even with the elector of Brandenberg, that the Safe Conduct should not be observed, it would have been all over with him, if a miracle had not rescued him. His life was in danger on many other occasions, as when, for instance, he preached a very sharp sermon in Wittenberg in 1520, and at Orlamunde in 1522 among the adherents of Carlstadt, and in 1525 during the peasants' war.

The popes, the emperor, many kings, electors, dukes, princes, counts and others thirsted for his blood and secretly devised all means to rid the world of him, which he regarded as a high honor. He himself says, after enumerating the above official dignitaries, he adds, "Monks, priests, other great asses, the learned and the whole world are betrayers, murderers, hangmen, are longing to lick Luther's blood, with the devil and all his crew. Shame to yourself; I scorn my own blood when I think, that I am to be the victim of such exalted murderers and hangmen; the emperor of Turkey himself is worthy of such honor, not such a poor beggar as I am." The Church history

of that period every where tells us that the highest church authorities had contrived schemes for his destruction, and the emperor was so embittered against him by the false representations of his enemies, that he issued that severe edict of Worms, in which upon forfeiture of all official dignities and civil rights, he forbade all men from entertaining, aiding, feeding, protecting by word or deed this cursed outlaw." If this edict had been executed, Luther would have been a dead man before a week and what is the reason it was not executed? Pallavicin attributes it to the policy of the emperor, and says he was not in earnest in the publication of it and was even aware of the intention to abduct Luther to the Wartburg. This is not probable, for there is no allusion to it in the report of Spalatin who knew all about the affair from beginning to end. Matthiasius in his Sermons seems disposed to believe that the emperor connived at the proceeding, but gives no proof of it. The emperor himself in a letter to the elector Frederick, of July 15, 1524, renders the fact very unlikely, for in it he expresses his displeasure at the Nurnberg edict and commands that the edict of Worms shall be rigidly observed, at the same time branding Luther as an inhuman and unchristian man, who is infusing his sugared poison into all, and aims, like Mohammed, in raising a crowd of followers. Could he write thus if he had connived at the concealment of Luther? Maimbourg thinks that the execution of the edict against Luther was not carried out on account of the sudden departure of the emperor from Germany to quell a sedition in Spain. Seckendorff observes that the absence of the emperor was a secondary cause but that divine Providence was the primary. It just happened at this very time, not sooner or later, that something occurred in Spain to call the emperor home, just at the very time when the design of the pope and his clergy to annihilate Luther by the influence of the emperor, might be and was frustrated! We are here reminded of an analogy from Bible History. Sennacherib the king of Assyria, when he would invade Israel which much alarmed Hezekiah, but Isaiah quieted his fears by saying "Be not afraid—he shall hear a rumor and shall return to his own

land," and thus Hezekiah was saved. The peace of the Christian Church at Jerusalem was secured because the Jews found it necessary to think of their own safety from the attacks of Caligula. Charles V. urged the execution of the edict, even from Spain. Henry VIII. of England wrote to the elector Frederick, dukes John and George of Saxony and to the elector Ludwig of the Palatinate and declared that he would forfeit his kingdom, even his own blood, for the burning of Luther. King Ludwig of Hungary and Bohemia and king Emanuel of Portugal also declared themselves willing to lend all their influence to the annihilation of Luther. Duke George of Saxony used all his influence with other reigning powers to sacrifice the Reformer in the very beginning of the work.

#### LUTHER'S FEARLESSNESS.

Luther was fully aware of many of these desperate intrigues against his life and yet, besides prayer, he employed no other means for security. He remained in Wittenberg, although he was urgently entreated to leave it. He admitted every body to his presence, freely walked about the city and visited his friends by day and night, although vehemently warned to be cautious. An ardent friend writes to him from Erfurt and among other things says, "I myself heard a robust centaur and he was a Canon also, publicly declare that it would be an easy matter to abduct Luther and to deliver him into the hands of the pope. Look sharply around you. Be a hundred-eyed argus." Luther alludes to these warnings in 1521, and says, "I was daily advised, not only by my fellow citizens but by letters from many other places, not to make myself so familiar with every body and they severely rebuke my boldness in exposing my life." He did not consent to be secreted on the Wartburg from fear of the ban, but in obedience to the wishes of his elector. He presented himself again before the mighty German nation with extraordinary boldness and seemed to exclaim through many published writings, "Here I am, the Luther, put under the ban by the Court of Rome, and outlawed by the edict of the emperor. Do with me what you like!" He did not desire that for his sake, any gate of Wittenberg should be

kept closed, but advised that a free Conduct should be given to those who should come there to arrest him. He challenged those in authority to exert all their power against him. "Now, my dear Princes and lords, you are hurrying me a poor, unworthy man to death; \* \* only go ahead with all your vigor, kill, burn, I will not stir an inch, by God's help; here I am and I respectfully beg you when you have killed me, not to wake me up again, to kill me a second time."

#### LUTHER WILLING TO BE A MARTYR.

If the papists and even Luther's own wishes had been gratified, he would not have died on a bed of feathers, with hands peacefully folded, and surrounded by sympathizing and weeping friends, but on a scaffold with his hands tied to a stake behind him, amid the demoniac jubilant yells and scoffs of an infuriated mob, whilst his body was consuming with fire. As a reformer and a divinely chosen witness of the truth, it was necessary that with other qualifications, he should be endowed with a perfect willingness to seal his doctrine with a bloody martyr's death. The will was sufficient, just as it was with Elijah the Tishbite and John the Evangelist, though neither suffered a martyr's death. We discover this disposition in Luther manifested to the highest degree. He had not only resolved to endure all the torture and indignity of a painful capital execution, in the certain hope that his faithful God would support him in the terrible suffering, but he would have regarded it as a distinguished honor, if he had been compelled to confess the gospel in chains, in fire or seething oil. Hence he wished that he might be considered worthy of wearing the martyr's crown—yea, even regretted that in this respect it was not allowed him to be on an equality with other martyred witnesses for the truth. His letters and other writings frequently express this perfect willingness to die for Christ's sake.

It cannot be denied that for four or five months after the publication of the theses, the reformer keenly suffered from apprehension of a violent and painful death with which he was threatened by the papal indulgence dealers, who positively declared that before long he would be publicly burned. For even

though soon after, he grew more bold, yet even down to 1519, he had not entirely recovered from this well founded apprehension. The reason is obvious. He was not sure whether he had done right or wrong in beginning the indulgence controversy, and was waiting for the decision of the pope. Now, scarcely for the cause of right will a man die, yet peradventure for something good or for a good man some would even dare to die, how then could he be willing to die, if he were not sure that he was right and thought that he had sinned by disturbing the peace of the papal church, of whose prejudices he had not yet freed his mind? It was these prejudices still clinging to him and not the fear of death, which caused him to keep silent for several years. But as soon as divine grace opened his eyes, these painful anxieties were dispelled and the more fearless Christian boldness pervaded his whole nature, and this like all Christian graces was of gradual growth. In 1518, though not yet entirely free from solicitude, he could thus write to Staupitz, "My poor body weakened by constant apprehension and misfortune still exists; let them destroy it by intrigue or open violence; let them inflict the greatest injury upon me; let them shorten the period of my existence only an hour or two, they will only be helping me that much sooner to heaven"—and to Casper Link, he wrote, "His holy will be done; the more they threaten, the more consoled I am; my wife and children are provided for; I have made a proper disposition of my estate; my honor and name are already sadly maligned and nothing remains but my poor, enervated body; if they take that away from me, they will only make me several hours the poorer, but the soul they cannot take, etc.—hence, pray that the Lord Jesus may enlarge and sustain the spirit of his sinful servant."

His faith grew and with it his willingness to die. He wrote to Spalatin, "I almost wish that I might fall into their hands, so that they might satiate their vengeful wrath, if I were not too solicitous about God's Word and the little flock of God's people." At Worms in 1521, he said to Spalatin as they returned to the hotel from the Diet, "If I had a thousand heads, I would rather allow them all to be cut off than recant. I have promised my God to be faithful to death, even if the world

were full of devils." He would cheerfully have died, but herein as in many other ways, he showed his German patriotic spirit." He was concerned for the prosperity of the emperor and of Germany, for the results of his execution might have been the same to Charles as those of the burning of Huss were to Sigismund, the ancestor of Charles. He had no good fortune after the martyrdom of Huss. "I would rather," he also said to Spalatin, "be murdered by the Romanists alone, than that the emperor should be involved in the affair." His willingness to die for Christ's sake reached its highest grade, when he heard of the steadfastness of numerous cheerful confessors of the faith in imprisonment and death and he regretted that it was not his privilege like theirs to confirm the truth with his blood.

Even if Luther did not, in fact, suffer martyrdom, yet he endured the most exquisite sufferings of mind by most outrageous assaults upon his honor and name and by the vilest conceivable slanders of men and the fiercest temptations of Satan. The whole vocabulary of opprobrious epithets was employed in calumniating his character and work, and not only by ordinary, vulgar opponents, but by pontiffs themselves, who descended from their exalted positions to defame a monk.

Not one of the schemes prepared for his destruction was carried out. Although artfully laid out and numbers were ready to execute them, thinking thereby of rendering God a service, yet they were all thwarted by a Providence who wonderfully protected His instrument to achieve a mighty work in the Church. "The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers took counsel together \* \* against the Lord's anointed, saying, Let us break his bands asunder, \* \* but the Lord had them in derision \* \* and vexed them in his sore displeasure."

## ARTICLE II.

## OF CIVIL AFFAIRS.\*

By REV. L. E. ALBERT, D. D., Germantown, Pa.

The Sixteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession treats of Civil Affairs, and reads as follows:

## XVI. DE REBUS CIVILIBUS.

De rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimae ordinationes civil es sint bona opera Dei, quod Christianis licet genere Magistratus, exercere, judicia, judicare res ex Imperatoriis et aliis praesentibus legibus, supplicia jure constituere jure bellare, militare, lege contrahere, tenere proprium, jusjurandum postulantibus Magistratibus dare, ducere uxorem, nubere.

Damnant Anabaptistas, qui interdicunt haec civilia officia Christianis. Damnant et illos, qui evangelicam perfectionem non collocant in timore Dei et fide, sed in deserendis civilibus officiis, quia evangelium tradit justitiam aeternam cordia. Interim non dissipat politiam aut oeconomiam, sed maxime postulat conservare tanquam ordinationes Dei, et in talibus ordinationibus exercere caritatem. Itaque necessario debent Christiani obedire Magistratibus suis et legibus; nisi cum jubent peccare, tunc enim magis debent obedire Deo quam hominibus.†

## XVI. OF CIVIL AFFAIRS.

Concerning civil affairs our churches teach that legitimate civil enactments are good works of God: that it is lawful for Christians to hold civil offices, to pronounce judgment, and decide cases according to the imperial and other existing laws: to inflict just punishment, wage just wars, and serve in them: to make lawful contracts; hold property; to make oath when required by the magistrates; to marry and be married.

\* Sixteenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 24, 1881.

† Hase Libri Symbolici.

They condemn the Anabaptists, who forbid to Christians the performance of these civil duties. They also condemn those who make evangelical perfection consist not in the fear of God and in faith, but in the abandonment of all civil duties; because the Gospel teaches the necessity of ceaseless righteousness of heart, while it does not abolish the duties of civil and domestic life, but specially requires them to be observed as ordinances of God, and performed in the spirit of Christian love. Hence Christians ought necessarily to yield obedience to their civil officers and laws; unless when they command something sinful; for then they ought to obey God rather than man.\*

#### HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

Many things were attributed to the Reformation by its enemies which had no legitimate connection with it. Among these were the disturbances caused in the German Empire by the Anabaptists. The earliest historical notice of this sect is connected with these disturbances, originating with "the prophets of Zwickau," which began in the year 1521, and culminated in a fierce civil war. The leader of these prophets was Thomas Münzer, the Lutheran pastor of Zwickau, who by the perusal of the works of the mystic Taules had become a wild fanatic. Being deposed from his post at Zwickau, he retired into Thuringia, where he propagated his tenets. Those tenets were: "(1). That the true word of God is not Holy Scripture, but an internal inspiration. (2). That the baptism of infants is unlawful. (3). That there must be a visible kingdom of Christ upon earth. (4). And that in the kingdom of Christ all must be equal and must enjoy a community of goods."† At this crisis, the long-impending rebellion of the peasantry against the nobility broke out in southern Germany, and in a short time spread through Suabia, Franconia and Alsace. At the first breaking out of this war, it seemed to have been kindled only by civil and political views, and aimed only at the diminution of the tasks imposed upon the peasants, and to their obtaining a greater measure of liberty than they had hitherto enjoyed. But

\* General Synod's Translation.

† Blunt's History of Sects and Heresies.

no sooner had the enthusiast Münzer put himself at the head of this outrageous rabble, than the face of things changed entirely, and the civil commotions were turned into a religious war. Although there was a difference of sentiment among the seditious multitude, and they were greatly divided in their demands, yet their leading views, according to Dr. Dorner, were as follows: "The Anabaptists are indeed amongst themselves very different. Some are rather of a passive nature, and approach in their appearance to certain monastic orders, such as the God resigned praying Baptists, who did almost nothing but pray, and made praying their work; the secluded spiritual Baptists, who could not see laughter nor mirth without sighing, and who, after the fashion of the monastic orders, laid down definite rules with regard to clothes, walking and standing; so too the ecstatic and the silent brethren. Others are urged rather by practical impulses, whether it be to introduce by force the holy kingdom, or to employ themselves in teaching, as the apostolic brethren, who preached repentance, evangelized, forsook wife and children and, after the fashion of the begging orders, let themselves be nourished by others. Others again, the so-called free brethren, are Antinomians: after having received true baptism, it is impossible to sin anymore; community of goods and wives belong to the holy kingdom; nothing external is of any importance. God looks upon the heart, hence one may even deny the truth under persecution. Still all these tendencies have also a common family likeness. Besides the above described elevation, after an enthusiastic fashion, of the spirit of the internal Word of God above the Holy Scriptures, they have a *church ideal*, which is essentially impregnated by Romish ideas. Their doctrine of faith in relation to works, is also anything but the reformation doctrine: it rather occupies essentially the Romish standpoint. Man becomes pious before God not by faith without works, but by the infusion of love and holiness (which most certainly evidences itself according to their views in a sort of communism). \* \* And finally it stands related to the Romish Church in that both occupy a kindred position towards the State. Whilst both aim in the most decided manner at the State form of community, for what they call

the Church, they both regard the State in itself as profane in its nature and as having no proper independent moral significance. The Anabaptists forbid Christians to take offices of civil authority, oaths, or military service, although they do not disdain the means of external compulsion, which only become the State, for the purpose of carrying out their theory. \* \* They would, that only the exclusively divine will should prevail, in whatever form it may make itself known. They are thus the enemy of all natural human ordinances and would have them supplanted by theocratical."\* In carrying out these principles they rushed without reflection or foresight into every act of violence and cruelty, and committed disorders which rendered them justly odious in the sight of all law-abiding people. To put down this rebellion, it was necessary for the princes of the empire to resort to arms. Accordingly, in 1525, the turbulent malcontents were defeated in a pitched battle at Mülhausen, and Münzer the ring-leader was put to death. Of course the enemies of the Reformation, unceasingly repeated that Luther and his doctrines had caused the insurrection. They asked the Reformer with a malignant sneer, if he had not at length discovered that it was easier to kindle a conflagration than to put it out. It was unfair however to charge these troubles upon the Reformation, though they may have been indirectly influenced by it. The event certainly favored liberal ideas, but the causes which led to these disturbances existed long before the Reformation. The Reformation only gave new force to the discontentment already fermenting. Luther did all in his power at first to prevent and then to put down these agitations. "Revolt," he had said, "does not produce the desired amelioration and it is condemned by God. What is revolt, if it be not a man's revenging himself? The devil tries to stir up to revolt those who embrace the Gospel, with the view of bringing reproach upon it: but they who have rightly understood my doctrine, do not revolt." "A Christian," he would say, "ought to endure death an hundred times rather than take the slightest imaginable part in the revolt of the peasants." To the elector he wrote: "What gives

---

\*History of Prot. Theology.

me particular delight is, that these enthusiasts themselves are boasting to all who choose to listen to them, that they do not belong to us. It is the Spirit that impels them they say; and as for me, I answer: It is an evil spirit that bears no better fruits than the pillage of monasteries and of churches: the greatest robbers on earth are capable of doing as much." In fact, Luther had never ceased to combat the rebellion. "Not satisfied with using his pen, even while the insurrection was as yet in all its force, he left Wittenberg and traversed some of the most disturbed districts. He preached, he strove to calm men's minds, and his hand with a might that it derived from God, diverted, appeased, and restored to their proper bed the furious overflowing waters."<sup>\*</sup>

From all this it can be seen, that when the Reformers came to the preparation of the Augsburg Confession, they would embrace the opportunity then presented to set themselves right before the world on Civil Affairs, and show in what Government consisted, what were its functions, and what were the rights and duties of those who were its subjects. This was done in the Article under consideration. To ascertain the correctness of this delivery, let us look at some of the theories which men have held in reference to Civil Government.

#### THEORIES OF GOVERNMENT.

The theories which men have held in regard to Civil Government may all be reduced to two: the theory of the *social compact*, and the theory of *divine institution*. The former theory is thus condensed by Dr. Dwight. "This doctrine supposes that mankind were originally without any government; and that in an absolute state of nature they voluntarily came together for the purpose of constituting a body politic, creating rulers, prescribing their functions, and making laws directing their own civil duties. It supposes that they entered into grave and philosophic deliberations; individually consented to be bound by the will of the majority; and cheerfully gave up the wild life of savage liberty, for restraints, which however neces-

---

\*D'Aubigne Hist. of Reformation.

sary and useful no savage could ever brook, even for a day. Antecedently to such an assembly and its decisions, the doctrine supposes that men have no civil rights, obligations or duties, and of course, that those who do not consent to be bound by such a compact, are now not the subjects of either: such a compact, in the apprehension of the abettors of this doctrine, being that which creates all the civil rights, obligations and duties of man."\* It is a favorite theory of the advocates of this doctrine, that "society exists by virtue of each individual conceding some portion of his rights in order to preserve the rest, and that society has no rights beyond the limits of such concession." The doctrine is thus stated by its great expounder, the Marquis Beccaria. "It was necessity that forced men to give up a part of their liberty: it is certain then that every individual would choose to put into the public stock the smallest portions possible; as much only as was sufficient to engage others to defend it. The aggregate of these, the smallest portions possible, forms the right of punishment: all that extends beyond this is abuse, not justice." Applying this theory to the right of society over life, he says: "Did anyone ever give to others the right of taking away his life? Is it possible that in the smallest portions of the liberty of each, sacrificed to the good of the public, can be contained the greatest of all good, life? If it were so, how shall it be reconciled to the maxim which tells us that a man has no right to kill himself, which he certainly must have if he could give it away to another."†

This same idea is maintained by many who are seeking to abolish capital punishment. Its advocates insist that "no man ever bartered away his original right in his own existence;" that the right to life is "a reserved right which was never surrendered to society." In a report to the Massachusetts Legislature, Mr. Rantoul says, "When we surrendered to society the smallest possible portion of our liberty, to enable us the better to retain the aggregate of rights which we did not surrender, did we concede our title to that life with which our Creator has endowed us? Is it to be conceived that we have consented to

\*Dwight's Theology, Vol. III., Page 324.

†Essay on Crimes and Punishments.

hold the tenure of our earthly existence at the discretion or the caprice of a majority, whose erratic legislation no man can calculate beforehand? While our object was to preserve as little impaired as might be possible all our rights, which are all of them comprehended in the right to enjoy life, can we have agreed to forfeit that right to live while God shall spare our lives, which is the essential precedent condition of all our other rights? Have we entered into any such compact? The *burden of proof* is wholly upon those who affirm that we have so agreed. Let it be shown that mankind in general or the inhabitants of this commonwealth in particular, have agreed to hold their lives as a conditional grant from the State. Let it be shown that any one individual understanding the bargain and being free to dissent from it, ever voluntarily placed himself in such a miserable vassalage. Let there at least be shown some reason for supposing that any sane man has, of his own accord, bartered away his original right in his own existence, that his government may tyrannize more heavily over him and his fellows, when all the purposes of good government may be amply secured at so much cheaper a purchase. In no instance can this preposterous sacrifice be implied. It must be shown by positive proof that it has been made, and until this is undeniably established *the right of life remains among those reserved rights which we have not yielded up to society.*" This theory proves too much. Carried to its legitimate conclusions, it runs into absurdity. If this theory were correct, society would have no right to imprison or fine any of its members. Government would be a mere rope of sand. Convictions for crime would be an utter impossibility. Every criminal could plead that he never entered into a compact which involved the surrender of personal liberty, or agreed to suffer *any* penalty which the law might inflict upon him. Such a theory reduced to practice would disarrange society and resolve it into chaos. The entire fallacy of this theory lies in the fact that man is regarded as being naturally an isolated and independent being, as having no necessary connection with his fellows, and as being led to associate together by express or tacit consent, only for mutual protection and advantage. But such was not the natural condition of man. Man, from the very

beginning, has existed in society. He was born in it, his very existence is a proof of it. Says Blackstone, "We cannot believe with some theoretical writers, that there ever was a time when there was no such thing as society. \* \* This notion of an actually existing unconnected state of nature, is too wild to be seriously admitted: and besides it is plainly contradictory to the revealed accounts of the primitive origin of mankind, and their preservation two thousand years afterwards: both of which were effected by the means of single families. These formed the first society among themselves: which every day extended its limits, and when it grew too large to subsist with convenience in that pastoral state wherein the patriarchs appear to have lived, it necessarily subdivided itself by various migrations into more. Afterwards as agriculture increased, which employs and can maintain a much greater number of hands, migrations became less frequent: and various tribes which had formerly separated, re-united: sometimes by compulsion and conquest: sometimes by accident and sometimes perhaps by compact."\* Where man therefore exists there is society, and where society exists there also in some sense does the *state* exist. "For when society is once formed, government results of course as necessary to preserve and keep that society in order." Lieber in his Political Ethics, says, "Human society exists of necessity, and the state being part of the human society \* \* it exists likewise of necessity. \* \* The State is aboriginal with man: it is no voluntary association, no contrivance of art, nor invention of suffering, no company of shareholders; no machine, no work of contract by individuals who lived previously out of it; no necessary evil, no ill of humanity which will be cured in time and by civilization, no accidental thing, no institution above and separate from society, no instrument for one or a few—the State is a form and faculty of mankind to lead the species towards perfection—it is the glory of man." This theory of a social compact is therefore a false theory. Men never stood isolated and independent as this theory represents them; they were born into the household,

---

\*Commentaries, Vol. I. Introduction.

and the household grew into the nation. Association was not an act of their own free will; it grew out of their existence, and can never be set aside but by an act of rebellion.

Standard writers on Political Ethics have pointed out the fatal consequences attendant upon such a theory of government. They have shown most conclusively that if the social compact is the true foundation of government, then the subject ought to abide by the form of government which he finds established, be it ever so absurd, inconvenient or oppressive. If it is a despotism he must submit to it, for by the compact he has promised obedience to it, and no man can ever withdraw himself from the obligation of his own promise. They have shown also that every violation of the compact on the part of the ruler, releases the subject from his engagements and of course from all obligation to obey the laws. "As in private contracts, the violation and non-performance of the conditions by one of the parties vacates the obligation of the other, so in the social compact every transgression amounts to a forfeiture of the government, and consequently authorizes the people to withdraw their obedience and provide for themselves a new settlement."\* Such a course would endanger the stability of any government and lead to nothing but confusion and sedition. They have likewise pointed out, how on the same principle, "if a subject violate any of his engagements, however small, the ruler may lawfully make him an outlaw, and deprive him of every privilege which he holds as a citizen." Surely such a theory disproves itself, and contains the elements of its own overthrow.

Over and against this theory we place the other and correct theory, that Civil Government is a *divine institution*. It is not a human contrivance instituted without necessity by human caprice. It is not the usurpation of a few over the many, which may be dispensed with whenever the many are disposed to throw it off. It belongs to the settled order of things which God has clearly willed to exist for the well-being of man. It springs out of the necessities of things, and embraces in its range the entire race. It is indispensable to human happiness;

---

\*Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy.

to the safety of life, liberty and property; to peace and good order; to morals and religion; to the very existence of society itself. Without it the relations which exist between man and man cannot be perpetuated and perfected. Civil government is needful to guarantee to men their mutual rights. It is needful to check the unbridled indulgence of man's passions, to throw a safeguard around both person and property, to control the lawless and disobedient and inspire a sense of security against crime and anarchy. That Civil Government is indispensable to the highest good of man is evident from his actions. No matter what his color or race or condition, he cannot exist without some form of civil government. He must live under law, and in various ways he gives shape and utterance to this feeling. His conviction is deep and earnest though often rudely expressed, that government is a necessary and unavoidable accompaniment of his existence, and that the end of government is the good of mankind. And this is the conviction of the Jew and the Mohammedan, the Papist and the Protestant, the Atheist and the Pagan. In view of these facts, there is force in the declaration of Hume when he says, "As it is impossible for the human race to subsist, at least in any comfortable or secure state, without the protection of government, this institution must certainly have been intended by that beneficent Being who means the good of all his creatures, and as it has universally, in fact, taken place in all countries and in all ages, we may conclude with still greater certainty that it was intended by that Omniscient Being who can never be deceived by any event or operation."\*

The form of government has not been prescribed by the Most High. There has been the patriarchal form of government and the monarchical. There have been aristocracies and democracies, oligarchies and republics. There have been governments absolute and limited, pure and mixed. The form of government as well as the persons who administer it, must naturally depend on the circumstances and will of the people. And yet whatever the form may be it is an ordinance of God. Men may

---

\*Hume's Essays, Vol. III., page 510.

adopt a particular form of government, but government lies back of their action and has for its foundation the will of God. The essence of government is not in human enactments but in the constitution ordained by God. Justly therefore has it been said, that he who tramples on it strikes a death-blow at an ordinance of God. In this view government has a peculiar sanctity. It rises before us as a system that should be inviolate. We feel that it is the supporter of our best interests, that it is linked to our very destiny.

Let us see now how this view agrees with the Scriptures. Let us look first at the remarkable passage in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. In the translation of Dean Alford it read as follows: "Let every soul submit himself to the authorities that are above him; for there is no authority except from God. So that he which setteth himself against the authority resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves condemnation. For rulers are not a terror to the good work but to the evil. Dost thou desire not to be afraid of the authority? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same, for he is God's minister unto thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he weareth not the sword in vain; for he is God's minister, an avenger for wrath unto him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs submit yourselves, not only because of the wrath but also for your conscience sake. For this cause ye also pay tribute; for they are ministers of God attending continually to this very thing. Render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." In writing to Titus the same apostle says: "Put them in mind to submit themselves to government, to authorities, to obey magistrates," and writing to Timothy, he exhorts that "supplications, prayers, intercessions, giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and gravity." To the same purpose is the language of Peter: "Honor all men; Love the brotherhood; Fear God; Honor the king." He also declares that the Lord "knoweth how to preserve the unrighteous unto the day of judgment under punishment, but

chiefly them that go after the flesh, in the lust of uncleanness, and despise governments. Presumptuous, self-willed, they are not afraid to rail at dignities."

These sentences, taken from different parts of the New Testament, all teach, with more or less clearness, that Civil Government is an institution of divine appointment, demanding a faithful and cheerful obedience. It is true that the different modifications of government are man's creation, but having become so under that wise ordination of which God was the author, they have in themselves a vitality and a binding force that commends them to our regard. And it is on this ground that the Scriptures give to government a lofty character. "They call upon man to hold in high regard its external form, even if it is the work of man's creation. They exhort men to submit to kings and governors, because they are those whom God has ordained to be ministers of good. Man is not to make void what God foresaw would be for his highest good." It may be well in this connection to add, that while Christianity has nothing to do with the *forms* of human government, it does not forbid us to entertain preferences in regard to them. Says Dr. Wayland: "I do not say that Christianity does not create a tendency to free institutions. I firmly believe that it does. Teaching universal equality of right, it could not do otherwise. All the true freedom on earth springs essentially from the Gospel. It is intended, however, to improve the condition of society, not by revolution and bloodshed, but by instilling into our bosoms a spirit of piety towards God and of justice and mercy towards men. While Christianity is doing this, it is rendering good government necessary and bad government impracticable. In the meantime it treats every existing government in obedience to the precept given by our Lord, 'Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. The civil authority is established: the image is stamped, and the superscription is engraved. The evidence of the actual existence of this authority is in the hands of every man. Its precept then is, Render to society, as represented by the magistracy of its choice, whatever society can

rightfully claim. Such I understand to be the teaching of Jesus Christ."\*

And with these views the Confessors are in full accord, for without committing themselves to any particular form of government they simply declare that "legitimate civil enactments are *good works of God*." Government, then, being of divine origin, they proceed to point out

#### THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF SUBJECTS.

We will understand more clearly their declaration if we glance briefly at the teachings of the Church up to that period on the subject of Christian morals. A scientific system of morals is nowhere taught in the New Testament. Neither Jesus, nor His disciples taught it in that form. During the first three centuries Christendom was engaged in a conflict with the prevailing religions of the Jews and heathen, and with the philosophy of antiquity, so that the teachers of the early Christian Church were prevented from thinking of a scientific development of morality. Their time was fully occupied in meeting the accusations of their enemies: in answering the objections which were brought against Christianity, and with exhibiting the excellencies of their religion, in contrast with the Jewish and heathen superstitions. But after this period, began to appear those corruptions, in the morals of the Catholic Church which gradually increased, until virtue itself was endangered. The tendency then, was towards a gloomy austerity, and the greatest importance was attached to retirement from active life, to solitude, fasting, celibacy and contemplative exercises. Realizing how little such principles were adapted to the common relations of life and that naught but confusion must arise from their general adoption, a distinction began to be made in morality. "*Common* morality was distinguished from the *higher* and all solitary discipline and self-denial were ascribed to the latter, to which men could devote themselves, only by freeing themselves from all ordinary obligations \* \* \* In the fourth and fifth centuries, the corruptions of Christian morals, not only continued but grew worse and were multiplied. Every form of supersti-

---

\* University Sermons, page 256.

tion gained the ascendancy among Christians: ceremonies were multiplied in public worship and an extravagant importance was attached to them, pilgrimages, fasts, a *life of celibacy* and voluntary poverty, and *freedom from all civil relations* were declared conducive to the highest degree of holiness. \* \*

Then mysticism helped on this state of things. According to the mystic theology, the souls of men were deemed to be actual parts and effluvia of the Godhead: their connection with bodies and inclination to sensual enjoyment were considered proofs of their degradation and pollution: and since their highest bliss and glorification on account of their relationship with God, consisted in nothing but their return to God, and in an entire confluence with the pure, original fountain of their being, it must of course be considered duty to withdraw as much as possible from every thing sensual, to free themselves from the regular business of life, and in undisturbed seclusion seek after union with God."\*

And this spirit pervaded the Church when the Confessors, were called upon, to embody their views in regard to the relations of Christian men with the practical business of life. Especially was this true of the Anabaptists. In the Formula of Concord, in Art. xii., of *Other Heresies and Sects*, under the head of "Anabaptist Articles which are intolerable in the Commonwealth," we find the following:

1. That the office of the magistrate is not under the New Testament a condition of life, that pleases God.
2. That a Christian man cannot discharge the office of magistrate with a safe and quiet conscience.
3. That a Christian man cannot with a safe conscience administer and execute the office of a magistrate, if matters so require against the wicked, nor can subjects implore for their defence that power which the magistrate has received of God.
4. That a Christian man can not with a safe conscience take an oath, nor swear obedience and fidelity to his prince or magistrate.
5. That the magistrate under the New Testament can not with a good conscience, punish criminals with death.

---

\*Christian Examiner.

Also under the head of "Anabaptist Articles which can not be tolerated in daily life" the following : 1. That a godly man can not with safe conscience hold or possess any property, but that whatever means he may possess, he is bound to bestow them all as common good. 2. That a Christian man can not with a safe conscience, either keep an inn, or carry on trade or forge weapons. 3. That it is permitted married people who think differently in religion to divorce themselves and to contract matrimony with some other persons who agree with them in religion.

We cannot but admire their breadth of view, their manly courage, their sound sense and their true interpretation of the Word of God, when the Confessors declared "that it is lawful for Christians to hold civil offices, to pronounce judgment, and decide cases according to the imperial and other existing laws : to inflict just punishments, wage just wars, and serve in them ; to make lawful contracts ; hold property ; to make oath when required by the magistrates ; to marry and be married."

Let us examine somewhat in detail, what is here specified.

#### ON THE LAWFULNESS OF CHRISTIANS TO HOLD CIVIL OFFICES.

The saying of our Blessed Lord to "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," should settle the right and duty of a Christian man to concern himself with civil affairs. Under the Old Testament dispensation, the prophets took a prominent part in the politics of their time, either protesting against the abuses of justice in the internal administration of the nation's affairs, or criticising without fear or favor its foreign policy. To claim rights, however, is to concede corresponding duties. The state offers to its citizens certain advantages, such as security from foreign foes, protection of life and property, and the management of affairs of public utility, and no one has a right to accept these advantages without discharging the duties of a citizen to the best of his ability. The neglect of the duties of citizenship is selfish : it is an attempt to obtain the advantages enjoyed by our neighbors while we shrink from bearing our share of the corresponding responsibilities. There are a thousand things required for the welfare of a great nation, which can only be accomplished through its acting in its collective

capacity. The members of a nation are mutually necessary, and have duties towards one another, just as the members of any other social body. Suppose all stood aloof from civil duties. There could be then no government, no regulation of human affairs for the public good, because there would be no persons left to undertake it. The absurdity of such a position is obvious. No doubt a man may be happier who minds his own concerns, and does not trouble himself about public affairs. But does he discharge his duties to his fellow beings in so doing? That he has such duties cannot be denied. Our duty to our neighbor comes next to our duty to God. We are bound to promote his happiness as far as lies in our power. To do this it will be necessary to see to it that he is under good government. A good government depends in a great degree upon its rulers. Our first duty then, where it is in our power, is to secure such rulers as in our judgment will seek to promote the legitimate ends of all good government. These rulers should be men not only endowed with the requisite talents for their position, but likewise men of pure and unexceptionable characters in private life. The very existence of a government is threatened, as well as the welfare of its citizens endangered, when evil-minded and ill-disposed persons are put in power, who will pervert that power to promote their own ends and strengthen themselves in office by rewarding their partisans. If, therefore, it is the bounden duty of every honest and upright man, of every sincere Christian, to secure rulers who will only be a terror to the evil and not to the good, then it is equally the duty of every good man to accept office, if it is conferred upon him. The objection to a Christian taking part in civil affairs, because it brings him into associations unfavorable to his piety, is not well founded. It is this very withdrawal from political life, which tends to the injury of society and an aggravation of the evils under which it suffers. Its result is to place the regulation of trade, the administration of justice and the guardianship of the public purse and peace in the hands of the worst of mankind. Surely this is selfishness under the mask of religion, a cowardly shrinking from necessary perils and a distrust of divine help, which are essentially wrong.

It has been well said that the notions and practices of many who teach this abstinence from the duties of citizenship while they live luxuriously in a peace and comfort which others secure for them, are just a fresh illustration of the old mistake which confounds asceticism with religion, and blasphemes the divine name by pronouncing that evil which God has ordained for the well-being and happiness of mankind. In our own republican form of government, in which the *people* are regarded as the only source of power, it will be our own fault if we have not efficient rulers. With the elective franchise in our possession, it remains with us to determine the character of the governing powers. The exercise of this right should be regarded by us as a solemn duty. One of the greatest dangers to our free institutions arises from the fact that the most disinterested will be and are inclined to neglect this privilege or duty, leaving thereby the choice of our rulers in the hands of those who have most to hope for from the success of their efforts. The theory of our government is that the voice of the people is the voice of God. At least the voice of the people is the voice by which we have stipulated to be governed. To make, then, this voice the voice of God, we must not only give expression to it ourselves, by conscientiously using the elective franchise, but also by educating intellectually, morally and religiously all who utter it. The masses *must* be educated. If they be *not* educated, power may come into the hands of the few, and of the few who have the least stake in the welfare of the republic. The voice of the people must be the voice of independent intellect and not the voice of bold and designing men, who take advantage of ignorance and party ties, to seize the reins of power and promote their own selfish schemes and personal ambition. A republican government is founded on the idea that there may be in the mass of the citizens sufficient intelligence and virtue to make wise laws and execute them faithfully. Thus the power that is in the possession of the people must be put again into the hands of the few. Into whose hands shall it be given? This is the question for every honest citizen to settle. Intelligent and virtuous people, will have no difficulty in settling it. The wisest and best men in the community, will be chosen to

be the depositaries of this power. By so doing our republic would not only be safe, but would be the very ideal of a perfect government. It is possible however for a very different order of things to take place. Men may secure office and power, through trickery and cunning, through party management and organization. They may play upon the ignorance of the masses upon their fears and hopes, until they sway them at their will, and cause them without a struggle to do their bidding. In such cases, the elective franchise is *not* the free and spontaneous expression of the popular will. It is simply an instrument by which political adventurers elevate themselves to office. The form of the republic may then remain, but the spirit has perished. The elective franchise exercised in ignorance and improperly used by others, is directly antagonistic to the spirit of a free government. It is just here, where our institutions are in the greatest danger. Unless the masses can be so educated, as to give an intelligent and honest suffrage, they will be governed by a few for their own purposes. Their passions and prejudices will be their masters, and they will become the servants of their servants. Of all governments such is the worst, because it is the government of a deluded or intimidated multitude. To elevate the masses therefore is a religious duty. It is equally a religious duty, to seek moral and religious worth, as essential qualifications for high public station. Whoever then has moral and religious worth; whoever is so situated, as to render him in the opinion of his fellow citizens a suitable person for public office, has not only a right to accept such office when tendered, but is inexcusable if he holds back upon private motives.

#### ON GIVING JUDGMENT AND DECIDING CASES ACCORDING TO LAW.

If it is lawful for Christians to hold civil offices, then it legitimately follows, that the duties connected with such offices must be discharged by them. To pronounce judgment and decide cases, naturally grow out of the proper execution of the laws, which every government finds necessary for the preservation of its own existence, and for the protection of the interests of society. Perhaps there is no duty which the magistrate is called upon to perform more frequently than "to inflict just punish-

ment" for offences committed. This subject of punishment has occasioned much discussion, and given rise to a great variety of opinions. The Confessors undoubtedly occupied the right ground, when they maintained that it was proper, "to inflict just punishment." Punishment, in its most general sense, is defined to be, the infliction of some evil upon an individual, with the intention that he should suffer this evil, and with a reference to some act done or omitted. In its legal sense, punishment is the infliction of some evil, according to judicial forms, upon an individual convicted of some act forbidden by law, and with the intention of preventing the recurrence of such acts. That punishment for crime is justifiable is almost self-evident. Laws must be made against crimes which strike at the great objects of civil society, and these laws must have an efficient sanction. Says Jeremy Bentham.\* "If we were to regard the crime which has been committed as an insulated event that could not recur, the punishment would be wholly thrown away: it would be only adding one evil to another. But when we consider that a crime left unpunished would leave the way towards the same offence, open both to the former delinquent and to all others under the influence of similar motives, we come to view the punishment inflicted upon the individual as a safeguard to all. Punishment, however vile an instrument in itself, and however repugnant to generous sentiments, rises into a blessing of the highest order, when regarded, not as an act of anger or resentment against a guilty or an unfortunate person who has yielded to hurtful propensities, but as a sacrifice indispensably necessary to the public safety." This opinion is a sufficient answer to the objections of many, who say, that punishment cannot remedy the evil committed—that it cannot revive the man who has been murdered, by killing the murderer, nor rebuild the dwelling which is burned by destroying the perpetrator of the ruin: and that to do so can be defended on no better principle than the unchristian spirit of revenge. Revenge does not enter into the idea of "just punishment." If society cannot punish a wrong-doer without malice, neither can God. Punishment is inflicted

---

\* Bentham's Theory of Punishment, Ed. Rev., vol. 22, Page 5.

to make crime odious, and to prevent its further commission upon the part of the perpetrator of the crime, or the remaining members of society. It is true that punishment is only one of the agents which society has at its command for the prevention of crime, but it is a very important one. The fact that it must be called upon when all other means have failed proves its absolute necessity. It shows that the magistrate bears the sword by divine appointment, and inflicts punishment in defence of society. And this punishment in certain contingencies may extend even to the taking of life. Especially is this true for the extreme crime of murder, to which the practice, if not the letter of our law has been conformed.

This right has been questioned, and where it has not been called into question, the propriety of it has been challenged. It is not our design to enter into a lengthy discussion upon this subject. Volumes have been written, and ably written, upon it. In a condensed form it has been treated in a masterly manner by Dr. S. S. Schmucker in his "Popular Theology." Both the right and expediency of it, are there fully pointed out and established. It may be sufficient to say that the weight of authority is upon the side of capital punishment for murder. The Bible evidently sanctions the *right* of civil government to inflict it. No ingenuity can alter the plain declaration, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man," Gen. 9 : 6. Neither can any sophistry overthrow the fact that the Apostle Paul recognized capital punishment among the powers of civil magistrates. No other interpretation can be given to these declarations: "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid *for he beareth not the sword in vain*, for he is the minister of God, a revenger of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." "I stand at Cæsar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or *have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die*: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Cæsar." Neither can it be denied that the punishment of death

is peculiarly appropriate in the crime of murder, and that notwithstanding all the diminutions of its efficacy, it presents to the mind an antagonistic idea most fit to encounter the temptation to the crime. At least it has always been the impression of mankind, throughout the ages, that the penalty of death should be inflicted upon the murderer whenever that penalty is necessary, for the protection of the lives of others and for the safety and defence of the community. Says a writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*:\* "In defence of these positions, we appeal to the common consent and consciousness of mankind, and to a deep and indestructible instinct of the human heart: a consent of consciousness impressed upon the pages of all history, both sacred and profane: exhibited with a few trifling and partial exceptions in the legislation and practice of all nations, ancient and modern, barbarous and civilized, pagan and Jewish, classical and Christian: a universal instinct, which began to utter itself in the conscience-stricken exclamations of the terrified Cain, and which has reverberated in the soul of every murderer from that day to this: which has been confirmed by the consenting voice of the poets, philosophers and sages of all time, and which, as we believe, finds a response more or less distinct in every unsophisticated human heart." This punishment, and all other "just punishments," being therefore right and proper, it remains only for every government so to execute its laws that they will not be trifled with or trampled upon with impunity. Let it be understood that the law cannot be evaded, and that punishment will inevitably follow its violation, and not only will the law itself be more respected, but punishment, in a great degree, will be lessened and society be better protected.

## ON WAR.

Passing from this subject, we come to the declaration that it is lawfull "to wage just wars and serve in them."

There are many eminently good persons, who believe that all war is opposed to Christianity, that it is wrong in its origin, in its principles, in its motives, in its means and all its legitimate results. Almost from the very beginning of Christianity,

---

\**Bib. Sacra*, Vol. L., page 286.

down to the present time, men have borne their testimony against it. The absolute inconsistency of war with the gospel, was the prevalent belief of the early Christians. Justin Martyr quoting the prophecy of Isaiah, "they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," says, "That these things have come to pass, you may be already convinced; for we who were once slayers of one another, do not now fight against our enemies." Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, discusses the same prophecy, and proves its relation to our Saviour by the fact that the followers of Jesus had neglected the weapons of war, and no longer knew how to fight. Tertullian says, "Custom can never sanction an unlawful act. And can a soldier's life be lawful when Christ has said that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword? Can any one who professes the peaceable doctrines of the Gospel be a soldier?" Origen, in his work against Celsus, says, "We no longer take up the sword against any nation, nor do we learn any more to make war. We have become, for the sake of Jesus, the children of peace. By our prayers we fight for our king abundantly, but take no part in his wars even though he urge us." Lactantius who wrote during the reign of Diocletian, expressly asserts that "to engage in war cannot be lawful for the righteous man, whose warfare is that of righteousness itself. In the twelfth canon of the Council of Nice, held under the reign of Constantine in 325, we read, "A long period of excommunication is attached as a penalty to the conduct of those persons who, having once renounced the military calling were persuaded by the force of bribes to return to it. Such a law would scarcely have been promulgated had not an opinion been entertained in the council, that *war itself* is inconsistent with the highest standard of Christian morality." And thus down through the ages and among all denominations of Christians, multitudes are found expressing similar opinions. To such Christianity and war are irreconcilable. "Christianity," say they, "saves men: war destroys them. Christianity elevates men: war debases and degrades them. Christianity purifies men: war corrupts and defiles them. Christianity blesses men: war curses them. God

says, thou shalt not kill: war says, thou shalt kill. God says, blessed are the peacemakers: war says, blessed are the warmakers. God says, love your enemies: war says, hate them. God says, forgive men their trespasses: war says, forgive them not. God enjoins forgiveness and forbids revenge: while war scorns the former and commends the latter. God says, resist not evil: war says you may and must resist evil. God says, if any man smite thee on one cheek turn to him the other also: war says, turn *not* the other cheek but knock the smiter down. God says, bless those who curse you: war says, curse those who curse you: curse and bless not. God says, pray for those who despitefully use you: war says, pray *against* them and seek their destruction. God says, see that none render evil for evil unto any man: war says, be sure to render evil for evil unto all that injure you. God says, overcome evil with good: war says, overcome evil with evil. God says to all men love one another: war says hate and kill one another. God says, they that take the sword shall *perish* by the sword: war says, they that take the sword shall be *saved* by the sword. God says, beat your swords into ploughshares, your spears into pruning hooks, and learn war no more: war says, make swords and spears still and continue to learn war."

Sometimes the argument against war is drawn from its horrors. What is war, say they, but the destruction of men; and who can contemplate for a moment what the destruction means without sorrow of heart! Men are sent to the battle-field and what does that mean? It means that a very large number of them will perish in the conflict, and that a greater number perhaps will be wounded and incapacitated for the active duties of life. It means that human life will be taken away under the most horrible forms. Surely such things cannot be right? Surely war is nothing else than folly, guilt and mischief.

Now it must be admitted that the spirit of war is condemned by the genius of Christianity. And by the spirit of war we mean a warlike spirit, a desire for war, or a readiness for war. Such a spirit is repugnant to the spirit of religion. It is repugnant to it because it mostly springs from vain-glory, revenge and sordid ambition. And wars arising from these evil tenen-

cies are opposed to the genius of religion. Christianity frowns upon them. Christianity has nothing to do with vain-glory, or revenge, or sordid ambition, but to condemn the whole of them. But, that just wars are opposed to Christianity is another question. We know that mankind are made for society: society requires government, and a government without penalties or without the right and power to enforce its penalties and coerce the obedience of its own subjects, would be not only a nullity in practice, but a contradiction in terms. In the present state of society we cannot dispense with the use of force, and if force be used at all it is almost impossible to draw a distinction between the use of it in one form and another. If force be at all lawful it must be used to accomplish the desired end. We do employ it in the prevention or repression of crime and rebellion. If this is allowable, how is it possible to distinguish between the use of physical force for internal security, and its employment for the defence of a country against external aggression. In the latter case, the prowess of the battle-field is neither more nor less glorious than the courage and fidelity to duty shown by a policeman in capturing a desperate burglar.

"Civil society," says Wayland, "assumes the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual. Having assumed this duty it is under obligation to discharge it. If it cannot be discharged without the use of force, it is authorized to use force to the extent which the obligation that it has assumed renders necessary. In order to prevent wrong it has a right to summon to its aid the assistance of every citizen, and he is bound to render it. Every individual is a member of that society which has promised to secure to his brother the enjoyment of those rights bestowed upon him by his Creator; and that promise every man is under moral obligation to redeem. But suppose that he is exposed to injury from a member of another society, is he not entitled to the same protection? It seems to me that he is; and that the society to which he belongs is bound to protect him, whether he be assailed by one or many. It is the duty of the society to which he belongs to restrain *him* from inflicting injury upon all *other men*, and to prevent *all other men* from

inflicting injury upon him."\* In regard to the maxims of Christianity, such as "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," which are supposed to teach that all war is wrong, it has been justly held that they are undoubtedly precepts regulative rather of personal and private action than declarative of the procedures of governments and states. They are strong expressions, intimating the necessity of a firm curb on our passions, rather than that never is evil to be resisted or wrong-doing suppressed by force. If they can be literally interpreted so as to inculcate that all war—war of defence for instance, for dearest liberty and rights is contrary to Chistianity, then by the same method of interpretation governments and magistrates are also so contrary. The sword is their emblem and force is their argument, and plainly are they spoken of as the ordinance of God, whose duty it is not to bear the sword in vain, to be a terror to the ill-doer and a praise to them that do well. While however just wars may be waged, how rarely does the occasion arise which will justify war. The great mass of wars when tested by the maxims of Christian principle and prudence will be found wanting. Such are wars of ambition, undertaken for natural glory and aggrandizement, wars of retaliation and revenge, predatory wars, wars of conquest and propaganda. For such wars we make no defence. They are unjust wars, or "murder on a large scale." But there is a vast distinction between such wars and a war waged to suppress domestic insurrection or to repel foreign invasion. In the case of domestic insurrection, the very existence of the government itself is threatened. Two paramount authorities can not exist in the same state. One must put the other down. This is civil war, and no matter how bloody the struggle may become, both God and man will acquit the government that seeks to uphold its authority and restore law and order throughout the land. In the case of foreign invasion, a government would be recreant to its trust that did not strain every nerve not only to maintain its own independence, but also to protect its citizens in the rights of person or property. The

---

\*University Sermons.

instinct of property and the instinct of self-preservation come immediately from God. To preserve these rights governments are instituted. They are to protect that which God has made most sacred upon earth. In an invasion this protection can only be exercised by a resort to the sword; and that government that will not resort to it, is false to its trust and beareth the sword in vain. And yet it must be conceded that while under certain circumstances war may be justifiable, it is nevertheless even in its mildest form a dreadful evil. We should dread it as we do the ravages of disease or a strike of the pestilence. Let it ever be described so as to excite aversion instead of pleasure and applause. And let us hope that as Christianity is better understood and becomes more prevalent, the differences between nations and individuals will not be settled by mortal combat but by peaceful arbitration. May that golden age soon come when men will be astonished at the barbarity of past ages, at the pretexts assigned for acts of outrage and aggression, at our armaments and military engines, at our needle guns, and howitzers and "peace-makers;" our Enfield rifles, revolvers and bowie-knives, and the whole family of deadly projectiles.

#### ON LAWFUL CONTRACTS.

As all rights, all duties, all obligations and all law grow out of contracts, the necessity of such contracts and the power of their enforcement by law is self-evident. We shall not therefore enter into the discussion of this subject, but pass on to the consideration of the next item, viz.,

#### ON HOLDING PROPERTY.

The right to hold property seems to be inherent in our nature. Appropriation and production are born with us. From our very childhood we aim to acquire something that we may call our own. This desire for possession lies at the root of everything good in society. It stirs up man to industry, it promotes individual independence, it is the basis of social advancement, it is the producer of general prosperity, it binds society together, it is the friend of law and order and good government. The advantages of property are thus stated by Dr. Paley: "I.

It increases the produce of the earth. The earth produces little without cultivation; and none would be found willing to cultivate the ground if others were to be admitted to an equal share of the produce. 2. It preserves the produce of the earth to maturity. 3. It prevents contests. War and waste, tumult and confusion, must be unavoidable and eternal where there is not enough for all, and where there are no rules to adjust the division. 4. It improves the conveniency of living. This it does in two ways. It enables mankind to divide themselves into distinct professions; and it likewise encourages those arts by which the accommodations of human life are supplied, by appropriating to the artist the benefit of his discoveries and improvements; without which appropriation ingenuity will never be exerted with effect."\* It has been maintained however that the right to hold property is a concession to human selfishness, and was introduced by violence or cupidity under the artificial systems of government belonging to degenerate times. The chief instances usually adduced as proofs are, "the common hunting tribes of the North American Indians; Cæsar's mention that private and separate property in the soil was unknown to the Germans; the fact that the patriarchs had no fixed habitations, roaming with their herds wherever they listed; and that the Jewish Government recognized to a certain extent a community of property as seen in the edicts connected with the year of Jubilee." And yet when these cases are properly sifted, there is nothing in them. As it has been rightly observed, so long as a hunting ground was valuable the tribe in possession of it excluded all others from it. The pasture grounds occupied by the patriarchs were forbidden to any stranger leading his herds thither, while everything which had individual value in their eyes, their camels, horses, cattle, their tents and arms, they possessed separately. The Germans while they cared little for the land in itself, yet claimed the growing crop as the reward of their labors. The Jewish scheme of government was not only peculiar but unique, and whatever relations they sustained to Jehovah as land owners, do not obtain with us any more than

---

\*Paley's Theology.

numberless other principles of the Mosaic code which are wholly inapplicable to our state of things. It is true that some of the early theologians thought that the view of an original common property was supported by passages in the New Testament, in which it is related that the first Christians "possessed all things in common." But as it has been justly remarked : "If the Bible seems to support the theory of original common property or of its general preferableness in some passages, we ought not to forget others which indicate the contrary. Of the six commandments which, to distinguish them from the others of a more strictly religious character, may be called ethical, two relate to the sacredness of private property. We should not even *covet* our neighbor's property; and the code of Moses curses him that removes the landmark."<sup>\*</sup> The Bible rather encourages the possession of individual property. It teaches that the laws of God's providence reward industry, skill, uprightness with temporal prosperity. It nowhere condemns men for being rich, but only for the improper use of riches. Sometimes the argument against holding property is based upon the idea that its pursuit and its possession are detrimental to the Christian character. The occupations of men are branded as radically faulty and vicious as in themselves earthly and worldly. A distinction is sought to be drawn between things sacred and secular, and of course to the manifest disadvantage of the latter. But this very distinction is immoral and mischievous. It is divorcing religion from common life and teaching men that it is impossible to conduct their business according to the laws of Jesus Christ. Man is a being of two worlds, of the seen and unseen, and the duties pertaining to each are both from God. If it is his duty to love the Lord his God with all his heart and mind and strength, it is equally his duty to provide for his own and be ready to help his neighbor. To provide things honest in the sight of all men, lifts human toil from its drudgery and gilds it with the light of heaven. Labor has undoubtedly its place in the economy of God's providence for the supply of human wants. It may not be the highest form of religious ser-

---

\*Lieber on Property and Labor.

vice, but still it is an office in a divine order. Nay we go further, and assert that our very employments in our daily common life, are part of the divine economy to further the soul's weightiest interests, and develop a true, genuine Christian character. It is not by separating ourselves from the stirring interests and pursuits of life that we are best disciplined for usefulness and happiness. We are only rightly developed amid hardships to be endured and conflicts to be met. There can be no better field in which to show the power and grace of God, than amidst the busiest stir of secular pursuits. To be spiritually minded amid toils and difficulties, is a nobler achievement than to be spiritually minded amid solitude and repose. Such being the case, why should a man be forbidden to mingle in the business of active and intelligent life, to be industrious in every proper and lawful calling, and to reap the fruits of his individual enterprise and skill. Surely a man may be a man of faith, of prayer and of God, who seeks through the lawful pursuits of daily life not only to supply his own immediate wants, but also to place himself beyond the wants of the hour and become an instrument in God's hands to be a benefactor to others. This is certainly God's plan; a plan that is a stimulus to industry; a plan that awakens responsibility; a plan that calls forth individual endowments; a plan that accords with man's sense of right; a plan which the universal experience of mankind in all ages has proven the wisest and best, and most effective in its general results. To have a community of goods would require that men should be constituted differently; that there should be no difference of body, of mind or of temperament, otherwise the idle and the wasteful and the improvident, would be a drag upon the enterprising and industrious, and soon reduce the whole race to starvation.

ON THE LAWFULNESS OF THE OATH, WHEN REQUIRED BY THE MAGISTRATE.

An oath is defined to be "the calling upon God to witness, *i.e.*, to take notice of what we say, and invoking His vengeance, or renouncing His favor, if what we say be false, or what we promise be not performed." Says another, "It is a religious assertion, or asseveration, wherein a person invokes the Al-

mighty, renounces all claim to His mercy, or even calls for the divine vengeance upon himself, if he speaks falsely."\* According to another authority, it is defined as follows: "Oath; Saxon, *oath*,—Lat. *paramentum*—an affirmation or denial of anything before one or more persons, who have authority to administer the same, for the discovery and advancement of truth and right: calling God to witness that the testimony is true."<sup>†</sup> "An oath is an appeal to some superior being, calling upon him to bear witness that the swearer speaks the truth, or intends to perform the promise which he makes."<sup>‡</sup> Still, another definition is as follows: "A lawful oath is an act of religious worship, appointed by God, as a means of promoting truth and confidence, in which act of worship the presence of God is solemnly recognized, his omniscience, justice and supreme authority are acknowledged; and in which the juror enters into a special covenant with God and with society to speak or act truthfully—calling upon God to witness what he affirms or promises, and to inflict the temporal and eternal penalties of perjury if the truth be not spoken."<sup>§</sup> The forms of oaths have in all ages been various. Amongst the Jews it was the custom to hold up the right hand towards Heaven. This undoubtedly was the most ancient form. Abraham is said to have told the king of Sodom, "I have lifted up my hand unto the Lord, the Most High God, that I will not take anything that is thine," i. e., I have *sworn* by the Lord the Most High God. And this form of the oath seems also most appropriate. The lifting up of the hand towards heaven, is a direct appeal to that dread tribunal where the secrets of all hearts at last shall be revealed. Even the Divine Being is represented as saying, "I lift up my hand to heaven, and say I live forever," Deut. 32:40. The heavenly messenger whom Daniel saw in vision (Dan. 12:7), "held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swore by Him that liveth forever." The angel of the apocalypse (Rev. 10:5, 6), "lifted up his hand to Heaven and swore by *Him* that liveth forever and ever." Amongst the Greeks and Romans the form varied with the subject and occasion of the oath. Sometimes the contract-

\*Reese's Ency., art. Oath.

<sup>†</sup>Law Dictionary, by Jacobs.

‡Smith's Dic. Gr. and Rom. Ant.

<sup>§</sup>Junkin on the Oath.

ing parties, took hold of each other's hand and swore to the performance of what they had promised, at other times they touched the altar of the god, by whose divinity they swore. "Anciently," says a learned Greek archaeologist, "the person who took an oath *stood up*, and lifted his hands to heaven, as in prayer, for an oath was a species of prayer, and required the same ceremony."\* In many Christian countries, the most common form of the oath, is that of holding the hand upon the Bible, or the Gospels, whilst taking the oath and afterwards kissing the volume. In our own country, all persons are permitted to affirm, upon expressing their preference for this substitute of oath. Whatever the form may be, the *obligations* of an oath are not affected by it, nor do they depend upon it. "When a man *consents* to testify before a lawful tribunal, no matter in what *form* his consent is expressed, he *ipso facto* places himself in the position of one under oath; and so is held in the view of God and society. The truth of this position is recognized in all our laws against perjury, in which a violation of truth, by a witness under *affirmation*, is held to be perjury, as fully as if the oath had been administered in due form."† Dissatisfaction with the law and practice of judicial oaths is a thing of long standing in the world. The class of persons, who believe the taking of an oath to be forbidden by their duty towards God, is a class of by no means recent origin. It is spread over twenty-five centuries of history. "Greek philosophers have expressed their dissatisfaction, with Hebrew Rabbis, and Church fathers, Jewish Essenes with Christian Quakers, religious mystics and enthusiasts with disciples of the philosophy of Utility." In the early Christian Church there was a diversity of opinion upon the subject. This opinion appears to have been divided between the absolute refusal of oaths and a strong dislike to them. The refusal and the dislike, were based upon such precepts as "Swear not at all," and "Above all things my brethren swear not." In later times, the more thorough going and radical sects, have for the most part revived this article of the primitive Christian morality. The objection to oaths there-

\*Smith's Dic. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.

†Junkins on the Oath.

fore, is not a thing of recent origin. As an intellectual conviction, a moral feeling or a religious scruple, it has existed under very various forms in times and countries far remote from each other and in connection with the rudest possible diversities of opinion in other matters. And yet notwithstanding all this, the great mass of mankind in all ages have deemed oaths to be right and lawful. The testimony of the great body of the Christian Church has been in favor of their use. As an element of social government, the oath has been employed since the first organization of society among men. Long experience has confirmed its value in all lands. We do not hesitate therefore to assert, that oaths are both lawful and Scriptural. They are lawful, because by compelling a man to testify *truly*, the ends of justice are promoted and the public safety secured. They are lawful because by the solemn sanctions they impose, *confidence* is established between man and man, putting thereby an end to strife and increasing social comfort. They are lawful, because their existence in every age, and in different countries, proves that they must have sprung from a *common origin*, and this origin, one that God had given, for the proper government of the race. They are lawful however because they are Scriptural. They are proven to be Scriptural, because they are commanded of God. Nowhere is the oath forbidden in God's Word, but frequently it is enjoined. A few texts will suffice to prove this assertion. "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God and serve Him, and *shalt swear by His name*," Deut. 6 : 13. In Deut. 10 : 20, the same injunction is repeated: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, *Him shalt thou serve and to Him shalt thou cleave, and swear by His name*." And when we take in conjunction with these passages, the commandment, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain," what other interpretation can be given to them, but the use of the name of God in the oath, sincerely and reverently? In Is. 65 : 16 we read, "That he who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in the God of truth: and he that sweareth in the earth, shall swear by the God of truth." And in Jer. 4 : 2, "And thou shalt swear, the Lord liveth, in truth, in judg-

ment, and in righteousness, and the *nations* shall bless themselves in Him and in Him shall they glory." Upon this passage Scott remarks, "The constant mention of swearing, as an act and part of true religious worship, which in some cases is expressly commanded, constitutes a full proof, that they who understand certain passages in the New Testament, as indiscriminately prohibiting all oaths, lie under a mistake: for God could never have *commanded* that which is evil in its nature, as all oaths, by such an interpretation, are supposed to be." They are also proven to be Scriptural, by the Divine example. When God made a covenant with Abraham, He said, "By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah," Gen. 22:16. This transaction is often referred to in Scripture as the *oath of God*. In Heb. 6:13 and 17, the apostle declares that, "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself;" and that the reason for his so doing was, that "God willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel confirmed it by *an oath*." This quotation has been objected to on the ground "that what the Almighty may do in the exercise of his sovereign authority, is not *therefore* right for us. It would not follow that, because *He* may have sworn by *Himself*, we may also swear by *Him*."<sup>\*</sup> In other words the objection is, that the Supreme Lawgiver, who is above all law, may do that which the *subject* of law may not do. And yet "Jesus \* \* who was in the *form of a servant*, and was made in the likeness of *men* \* \* and became *obedient unto death*"—has set us the example of submission to the oath lawfully administered. When the High Priest said, "*I adjure thee by the living God* that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God: Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said." This was an affirmative reply to an oath, to which Jesus made no objection. Surely without any further argument, it must be admitted that the ordinance of the oath is approved by *divine example*. They are proven to be Scriptural, finally, by what is recorded of individuals. It is recorded of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob,

---

\*Lewis' Treatise on Oaths.

of Moses, of David and of Nehemiah, that they did not scruple either to take an oath themselves or to administer the ordinance to others. And these records contain not a word of censure, as to the use of the oath by them, but rather convey the impression that it met with the Divine approval. So in the New Testament, the Apostle Paul frequently uses expressions in the nature of oaths. "God is my witness;" "I call God for a record on my soul." For these and other reasons we believe not only that it is right to take an oath upon just occasions; but that its refusal is sinful, when lawfully called to the duty. The objection to oaths founded upon Matt. 5 : 34, "I say unto you swear not at all," and upon James 5 : 12, "But above all things my brethren, swear not" &c., we think has been satisfactorily answered by the generally received opinion, that these words relate not to judicial oaths but to the practice of vain, wanton and unauthorized swearing in common discourse.

It is to be regretted, however, that the administration of oaths has been employed to such an unlimited extent. Religious sanctions and the name of the Deity should not be forced into all the details of life, and mixed up with its most trivial concerns. The temptation to irreverence by such a course is very great. A too frequent application of strong excitements is as deadening to the moral as it is to the physical sense. Indifference to the obligations of religion will naturally follow from an ill-regulated and prodigal appeal to them.

#### ON MARRIAGE.

On the subject of marriage the Confessors are bold and outspoken. In Article xxiii. of Abuses Corrected, they use the following language: "Marriage was appointed of God to prevent licentiousness; as Paul says, (1 Cor. 7 : 2), "To avoid fornication let every man have his own wife." Again, "it is better to marry than to burn," (Cor. 7 : 9,) and according to the declaration of Christ that not all men can receive this word (Matt. 19 : 12). In this passage Christ Himself, who well knew what was in man, declared that few persons are qualified to live in celibacy; for God created us male and female (Gen. 1 : 27). And experience has abundantly proved how vain is the attempt

to alter the nature or meliorate the character of God's creatures by mere human purposes or vows, without a peculiar gift or grace of God. It is notorious that the effort has been prejudicial to purity of morals; and in how many cases it has occasioned distress of mind and the most terrific apprehensions of conscience, is known by the confessions of numerous individuals." And again, "If therefore it is evident from the divine word and command that matrimony is lawful in ministers and ecclesiastics, and history teaches that their practice formerly was conformed to this precept, if it is evident that the vow of celibacy has been productive of the most scandalous and unchristian conduct, of adultery, unheard-of licentiousness, and other abominable crimes prevalent among the clergy, as some of the dignitaries at Rome have themselves often confessed and lamented: it is a lamentable thing that the Christian estate of matrimony has not only been forbidden but in some places speedy punishment been presumptuously inflicted, as though it were a heinous crime. \* \* \* The apostle Paul denominates that a doctrine of devils which forbids marriage. And Christ says, "The devil is a murderer from the beginning." For that may well be regarded as a doctrine of devils which forbids marriage and enforces the prohibition by the shedding of blood." In Article xxvii., on Monastic vows, they say: "In the first place we teach that all who do not feel inclined to a life of celibacy have the power and right to marry. Their vows to the contrary cannot annul the command of God. "Nevertheless to avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." To this course we are urged and compelled both by the divine precepts and the general nature of man, agreeably to the declaration of God Himself: "It is not good for man to be alone, I will make an help-meet for him." And again: "But the common people are led into many injurious opinions by the false commendation of monastic life. When they hear a life of celibacy applauded without measure, it follows that their conscience is oppressed in their married state; for when the common people hear that the mendicants alone are to be regarded as perfect, they can not feel assured that they are not guilty of sin, in holding worldly

possessions and pursuing a worldly calling. \* \* And we read of many examples of persons who have forsaken their wives and children and also the duties of civil government, and confined themselves in monasteries. They regarded this as fleeing from the world and seeking such a life as is more pleasing to God than any other. They could not understand that it is our duty to serve God according to those commands which he has given and not those invented by men. But that is certainly a good and perfect state of life which is sanctioned by the law of God, whilst that is a dangerous condition or mode of life which is unauthorized by the divine law." These are brave and true words, and considering the circumstances under which they were spoken, as brave and true words as ever were uttered. The lawfulness cannot be denied. It is founded in reason and sanctioned by the word of God. Abolish this relation and what would be the result? The purposes of human society would be defeated; virtue would be disregarded, and man would live under the lawless control of his wild and wanton passions. The sweet influences of home would never be realized, and the education of each successive generation under the eye of parental love and watchfulness would be a thing unknown. Religion, patriotism, the purity of social life and the perfection of human society, all have their roots in the marriage institution. Marriage is the fundamental source and law of the family, and out of the family comes society, and out of society government, and out of government law and order and love of country and religion. It is consequently the deepest fountain of power, the strongest and most pervading influence in society. It is the richest field for human culture, for the education of men in all that is best and noblest for this world and the world to come. 'Tis true that there have been unhappy marriages and disordered and ill-regulated families, but for these the marriage relationship is no more to be blamed than religion is for the evils that have been perpetrated in its name. Its tendency is to lift up and not to cast down, to elevate and not to degrade, to bind together and not to separate, and where these blessed objects are not attained it is not the fault of marriage, but of that strange

perversity in our natures which abuses the best of gifts and turns life itself into death. To realize the true ideal of marriage we must look in upon a home, where two souls needing each other and drawn to each other, enter into a sacred covenant to share together the duties and joys and cares of life. Diverse in character and diverse in attributes, they compose together the perfect nature and live together the perfect life. Acting and reacting upon each other, they develop by their contrasts and differences each other's being. Under the influence of the wife the ruggedness of the man is softened and he is stimulated to deeds of virtue and noble daring; under the influence of the man the character of the wife is strengthened and her many excellencies developed. Each is a stimulus to the other—a stimulus to noble and fruitful living, such as constant contact cannot choose but give. "Mutual forbearance, mutual comfort, mutual strength, mutual guidance, mutual trust: common principles, common duties, common burdens, common aims, common hopes, common joys—here are the materials of life's truest, noblest discipline; here the metal of character is welded and moulded into forms of finished strength and beauty, meet for the Master's work and joy in the great assembly and church of the first-born in heaven."\* Then can we conceive of a finer field of usefulness than that which springs from the fruit and outgrowth of marriage? Do not the plastic influences of home outweigh all other influences in moulding the spirit and laying the foundations of character? Shut up within the charmed circle of this quiet life, where love should sway the sceptre and kindness rule the hours, surely nothing but courage and patience and constancy and intelligence and faith and hope and religion are needed upon the part of parents to make home the grandest and sweetest and most fruitful scene on the footstool of Jehovah. In that wonderful picture of the German nature and institutions which Tacitus painted as a bitter rebuke to the youth of degenerate Rome, the central point on which the whole interest turns is the fact that the home institution was prized by the German—that he held his house as his sanctuary, literally sacred to him,

---

\*I. Baldwin Brown.

as a shrine to its God. It is perhaps this reverence for woman and for the sanctity of homes, which characterized their life even in its rudest stages, which justifies the dictum of Hegel that "the destiny of the German peoples was to be the bearers of the Christian principles." Marriage then is undoubtedly a divine institution, founded not only in reason but expressly sanctioned by the Scriptures. "From the beginning of creation," says Jesus, "God made them male and female." That is, there was that in the constitution which he gave them, in the relation they sustained to each other, which made it proper to say that God had joined them together. The Scriptures brand with infamy the doctrine that forbids to marry. They often employ the connection as the image of the union subsisting between Christ and the Church. They assure us that marriage is honorable in all and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. It is alleged however that celibacy in itself is holier than marriage. This is the principle laid down by the Romish church as well as some other errorists. Is this principle a correct one. We deem it utterly incapable of proof, for the simple reason that no just comparison can be made between the relative merit of the two states in life. Marriage is undoubtedly the normal state of man. It is the design of God that the race should be continued, and this can only be done through the marriage relation. Celibacy is an abnormal condition, seeing it would lead to the extinction of the race, and thus must be contrary to the will of God. Can then this abnormal condition which is counteracting the designs of an infinitely wise God, be purer than the normal condition which is seeking to fulfill His will. "The barren fig tree, then," says an ancient controversialist, "was purer than had it been loaded with fruits." Besides, the advocates of celibacy have never been so unguarded as to say that it saves infallibly and of itself; no more have they said that in the married state salvation is impossible. Wherein then can a comparison be instituted between them in point of intrinsic merit? The only question that can reasonably be started is, "Which contributes most to salvation?" Bungener, in his "History of the Council of Trent," says in substance: "The matter in hand is not to know which of the two states is the

most *holy*, but which is best fitted to make people *holy*. Now in these terms any general and systematic answer is impossible. Such a one will find salvation in celibacy, without any marring of his comfort and happiness; another will find nothing in it but ennui, disgust, temptations, evil thoughts of every kind. One will grow better and better in it, thanks to the salutary pressure of his new duties; another will see in it only a yoke, and those same duties will have proved but the occasions of new faults. Therefore, we repeat, the question is one of facts, not of principles. Such an one may have been lost in celibacy who might have been saved in marriage. It is impossible to say, *a priori*, which of the states is the better of the two in respect of its effects, as to prove by serious reasons the intrinsic superiority of the one over the other."

#### THE RIGHT OF REVOLUTION.

One other item claims our consideration. It is found in the concluding part of this Article. The Confessors having declared that true religion does not consist, as some had taught, in the abandonment of all civil duties, but in the fear of God and in faith; because the Gospel teaches the necessity of ceaseless righteousness of heart, whilst it does not abolish the duties of civil domestic life, but specially requires them to be observed as ordinances of God, and performed in the spirit of Christian love," add: "Hence Christians ought necessarily to yield obedience to their civil officers and laws: unless when they command something sinful; for then they ought to obey God rather than man." As Government is a divine institution, the Scriptures in their general tenor as well as in many particular passages teach a due obedience to every properly constituted authority, which society may require for the protection of its own interests. No society whatever can exist, without a due subordination of its members, and subordination implies a supreme authority, which in one country exists in one form, in another country, in another. Whoever resists this supreme authority is an enemy to good order and the welfare of society, and, as such, is guilty of a crime the most reprehensible in its nature. But this doctrine of submission to legitimate government can-

not consistently with common sense be extended to all the abuses of which government is capable. For this is not only the destruction of every good, but the certain introduction of the worst evils that can be conceived. It is therefore contradictory to St. Paul's idea of a magistrate, who calls him "the minister of God for good," but if he thus becomes the minister of evil he is no longer the minister of God, and may with safe conscience be resisted to the utmost. If submission to all abuses may be defended from the doctrine of submission to government, we may by parity of reason defend even the pagan idolatry, because the Scriptures enjoin religious worship as a duty. It is true that law in the proper sense of the word is entitled to absolute obedience, but then this law must be consistent with the ordinations of God and the rights of man. It must be fundamentally holy, just and good. In the institution of Providence law itself has its proper boundaries. God has given no human power the authority to make any law which deprives His creatures of those rights and privileges which He has conferred upon them. And when such a law is established either by violence, by artifice, or by corruption, it has in reality no justifiable, though in mere form it may have a legal obedience. Opposition to it is founded in the very instincts of our nature, and is supported by the institutions of God. Hence, in the language of the framers of the Declaration of Independence, it does sometimes "in the course of human events become necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another," for "they hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute a new government," &c. This resistance, however, is to be understood as applicable only to laws which are real and manifest oppressions, and are not reconcilable with the laws of God or the rights of man; but it is not meant as a jus-

tification for those wild and insurrectionary movements, which, under pretence of grievances, oppose salutary laws, and from motives of discontent and faction are the disturbance and disgrace of civilized society. Neither does the right of resistance apply to every unimportant transgression beyond the bounds of legal prerogative. The peace of society is not to be disturbed by such causes. Obedience is due till tyranny begins to trample upon the dearest rights of man and overturns the fundamental principles of government.

In reply to the question, "May a legal government be resisted in unlawful demands, and may a people take up arms against a whole government previously considered lawful?" Lieber in his Manual of Political Ethics says: "When this question has been discussed without peculiar reference to practical cases of deep interest at the time, the greater number of jurists and philosophers have allowed that there are cases in which it is lawful and necessary to resist with arms, that is, to resort to insurrection. \* \* As to the principle there can be no doubt whatever. Every unlawful government ought to be resisted, and permanently changed, if it permanently and obstinately insists upon a course injurious to the people, and if the evils accompanying the change are not greater than the blessings to be obtained by the change. In the abstract we might easily go farther; we might say, Government ought to be resisted, whenever it acts unlawfully. But the unavoidable difficulty arises of deciding when it acts unlawfully, for the people may be mistaken as well as the government. Our forefathers enacted in many cases that if the ruler distresses the people against the law, it was lawful to resist him. \* \* The government is an organism, for the purpose of obtaining the great ends of the state, the state an institution to secure the great social and individual ends of humanity, and if the former ceases to obtain its object either from want of energy, or because it endeavors systematically and continually to undermine and destroy those ends, society has no doubt the simple right of establishing a new one, even where there is no particular compact between the rulers and the ruled. The government is no longer a lawful one, though established according to all the formalities of

the law, because no longer answering the purpose or obtaining the ends and objects of the law. Mankind have always acted upon this principle. Yet so necessary is a government; so unrighteous is it not to deliberate in all matters relating to society whether we may not injure others more than we assist them; so doubtful, calamitous, and frequently demoralizing are the effects of insurrection and of civil war; so easily is the individual deceived respecting his own rights and the probable success of measures which may appear suitable to the temperament of our mind at the time; so much increased is the evil of tyranny in case of unsuccessful attempt at resistance; and so frequently does resistance, even though successful against the government, lead to tyranny worse than the previous one, to military government; and so often does it open an arena for the worst passions and shallow mediocrity, noisy, forward, and unconcerned about the harm it produces; that he who resorts to force against the existing government, indeed, commits treason against society."

Whatever difficulties are connected with this subject of resistance, there can be no doubt as to our duty, when human authority seeks to set aside the plain commands of God. No human institution, though ordained of God, can over-rule the higher authority under which it acts. We are commanded to obey God rather than man, Acts 4 : 19 ; 5 : 29. Imperfection clings to every human government. Their rulers are not divine, even though government is a divine institution. Consequently human laws cannot be placed on a level with God's laws. In any conflict of authority between them, the lesser must yield to the greater. And especially is this true when human governments improperly undertake to regulate the kingdom of Christ, thus moving out of their own province and entering one that has laws and methods peculiar to itself. In concluding this discipline we cannot but express our admiration at the attitude of the Confessors on Civil Affairs. As Dr. Schmucker in his Popular Theology, has justly remarked, "it is certainly commendable, that living under a government so defective, the confessors should have uttered not a word inconsistent with the purest principles of republicanism; nay, that they even asserted

to the face of the Emperor, their right to resist such laws as they deemed sinful." Their views were broad and statesman-like, because they were founded upon the word of God. They spoke as men who had no favors to ask, and no fears to cloud their views. Honesty of purpose, sincerity of conviction, and solemn responsibility, breathe through all their utterances. Their eye being single, their whole body was full of light. Pure in heart, they saw God. In His light, they saw light. To cherish their memory is a sacred duty; to walk in their footsteps, a noble ambition; and to be guided by their sentiments is to be saved from error, and grounded in the truth of God.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THE SURVIVAL OF THE FEELINGS.

By REV. GEORGE F. MAGOUN, D. D., President of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.

The point of the acutest criticism yet made on the influence of George Eliot (in *Contemp. Rev.* for Feb.) is worth looking at in other relations. "Human love," says "one who knew her," (and obviously knew her well), "is interesting in her pages in inverse proportion as it bears the impress of the divine." "Almost always where love looks *downwards*, whether for good or for evil, her power is at its highest. Where it looks upwards, with few exceptions, her power seems to ebb, and sometimes altogether to depart." "We regret the attempts made by some of the admirers of this noble woman to conceal from themselves or others, the vacuum at the center of her faith. There is this excuse for such confusion, that her works, more than any others of our day, though it is true of so many, embody the morality that centers in the faith of Christ, apart from this center." "She sympathizes with the love of man to man, we should say, in proportion as it is unlike the love of man to God." "She was, we believe, the greatest opponent to all belief in the true source of strength and elevation for the lowly, that literature ever elicited, \* \* there was nothing wanting to her appreciation of the faith of the humble and the poor but a sense of

its reasonableness." With her, "one of the greatest duties of life was resignation. Nothing was more impressive, as exhibiting the power of feelings to survive the convictions that gave them birth, than the earnestness with which she dwelt on this as the great and real remedy for all the ills of life. \* \* \* Strange that it should be thought possible to transfer all that belongs to allegiance to the Will that ordains our fate except a belief in the existence of such a Will."

Such phenomena of mind and character as are here portayed, viz.,—the separation of feelings from the convictions and beliefs which legitimately produce them, and the survival of the former for a while after the latter are dead, are neither impossible, improbable nor unusual. They are commonly unnoticed, especially if the parent beliefs are religious. The character in which this writer finds these phenomena is a very strong one; circumstances make it just now one of extraordinary prominence; and the analysis of it here quoted is admirable for precision and skill. It is fitted to throw light on facts of general interest which are often ignored or denied.

Much of what is called patriotism is such a survival of feeling, originally begotten of public convictions and political beliefs that have more or less perished.

A flag, a national motto, a legend on the coat-of-arms of the State, had far more meaning to those who devised and adopted it than it ever has to those who come after them, who simply display or read it. We wondered, when our civil war broke out, if there would be more than military enthusiasm for the nation, if deep-rooted and intelligent popular convictions would disclose themselves; and we say that the flag of the Union acquired new significance to our generation during the struggle. But this indicates an amount of significance lost in the course of generations. To affirm in any case "we fight for principles, not for a mere banner," implies that men often fight for a banner, under the excitement of passion alone. An effective campaign-cry for a political party, is one which arouses instant enthusiasm without requiring thought; it need not express or even hint at any principle; enough if it be so sharp and stir-

ring that the simple sound, without a moment's reflection, inflames popular passion. A philologist or lexicographer, curiously running back the history of partisan epithets, nicknames, and rallying-calls, may find somewhere an original deposit of condensed ideas—just or unjust—for which the words once stood, but which were long ago left behind in party use. Sentiments of respect for laws and institutions even, long outlive the beliefs and aims that begat them. When these sentiments in turn perish, then institutions and laws, which have lost this support of feeling in the people, are quickly overthrown; but not inevitably when only the beliefs and aims die, if favorable associations of respect and wonted satisfaction in them still exist. Laws that conflict with vices, errors, and selfish inclinations of men, (like those against lotteries, liquor selling, houses of ill-fame, slavery, polygamy, &c., &c.,) constantly go down therefore under the pressure of these ever active and persistent evil inclinations, and even the moral feelings which sustain them against native depravity, must be rekindled ever and anon, by argument, instruction, exposure of wrong, and recital of the miseries which the laws are framed to prevent. Our social usages may be presumed to have had original reasons—unless they are exceptionally perverse or absurd—but who asks for the reasons when the usages have once become established in favorable regard? Such usages imply popular dispositions in their favor, and therefore do not, like laws which imply the opposite, fall out of observance or lose power at once when the reasons for them grow weak in men's minds. Whenever you find a mere fashion that once had a rational origin and explanation—which is seldom the case—you do not expect, nobody can expect, the legal axiom, *cessante ratione cessat ipsa lex*, to apply. For this axiom does not govern taste and art, even, altogether; much more what is so much a matter of caste feeling as fashion. But all three—fashion, taste, art,—may be so linked to emotion and passion, that even when they are shown to be without reason and against reason, they rule society. And it is a rule of mere feeling which throws light on that other rule of mere feeling once religious which is religious no longer, having lost its creed-root.

Now all this accords with uniform facts of mind, often called, but incorrectly, a law of mind. It is surprising how much the sensibilities can act with little or no proportionate intellectual action. This is exemplified in a certain power of words over them,—the well-known charm or sting of words to inflame unreflective, unthinking passion. In this way they have what has been called “a fatal imposture and force.” Says Burke “On the Sublime and Beautiful:” “Words, by strongly conveying the passions, fully compensate for their weakness in other respects,” i. e. as excitants of ideas. Thus he shows that the business of poetry and rhetoric is “to display rather the effects of things on the mind of the speaker, or of others, than to present a clear idea of the things themselves,” and affirms that poetry “depends so little for its effect on the power of raising sensible images, that it would lose a very considerable part of its energy” if it did this. We have known religious writers and speakers who seemed to confound religion with rhetoric and poetry at this point! Burke distinguishes between a clear expression and a strong expression, in this, that “the former regards the understanding; the latter belongs to the passions.” The philosophers and logicians recognize the common fact that words are made substitutes for thoughts; not only give us the power of “thinking in short hand,” but to dispense altogether with the thinking they conventionally indicate, and once called out. Some “have feelings of awe, sorrow, or affright so firmly associated with them, by long habit, that the mere utterance of them in a sermon,” says Bowen, “is enough to solemnize the minds of the congregation even before the hearers have time to think of what they mean.” Burke instances Virgil’s description of Vulcan’s cavern in Etna as very absurd in relation to the intellect, but very sublime as adapted to the emotions.

All this shows how—what has often been matter of wonder—terms and phrases that have lost their original Christian meaning can be used with a certain measure of good effect, and how they can even be used by those who have lost belief in what they express. Intellectually, the effect is *nil*, but even with certain surviving feelings, generally vague, [for the definiteness of our feelings depends on the ideas that psychologically go

before them,] they still have pertinency and force. And language expressive of feeling that once implied Christian ideas may be dissevered from those ideas, and in a diminished sense still express such feelings—*i. e.*, those of a similar kind, *minus* Christian ideas. This is what takes away from the justice of charging sheer dishonesty upon men who still use such language spite of their unbelief as to much—even the greater part—of what it once meant. And not only in individuals may a residuum of feeling survive the convictions to which it once belonged, but also in communities and in generations.

"It is possible, no doubt," says a living preacher, Dr. A. J. Gordon, in an admirable volume of sermons, "for righteousness to exist in the heart of an atheist. There are dead virtues just as there are dead works; there are consciences whose action is simply the unexpended momentum of divine influences long since rejected; there are virtuous instincts which are simply the reminiscences of a lost and forgotten state of innocence; there are exhibitions of truth and justice and honor, which are simply the old coins of righteousness, still passing current after God's image and superscription have been worn off from them, so that they who trade in them know not whence they are." The *Unitarian Review* recognized the other day that a whole style of living has been built upon evangelical supernaturalism, adding that even "among rationalizing thinkers, the most religious lives we have known as yet have been those nurtured upon the old foundations." So Dr. Channing retained virtues after he rejected orthodox truths of which these had been born in his soul and life in early youth at Newport. His veneration was the natural offspring of the Divine Sovereignty, as Hopkins preached it. His strained and exclusive notions of the Fatherhood of God never lost a certain dignity and unselfish purity and strength, *not their own*, which came from the Celestial Kingship he was taught at first. Very largely Dr. Channing's whole religious character was a matter of refined and noble feeling: his contributions to Christian thought were not considerable, and no effort of partisanship succeeds in giving them a large place: the impression he made on his time was chiefly a personal impression: it has been attempted to ascribe

this altogether to his denials of evangelical truth; but the influence over his Christian feelings of truths he had renounced, never was eliminated, and never can be. A follower of Matthew Arnold may keep fresh in his heart a measure of worship for a personal God, which the lean and strengthless theory of a mere "power not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," is impotent to supply. Righteousness is in itself personal, and there can be no power making for it that is not itself personal, spite of all theory. The rugged Scotch Titan, who has just passed away, held warm and sweet, in the depths of his turbulent and passionate soul, a mass of reverent associations and pious attachments that, in all his *Wanderjahre* among wild German denials and disordered fantastic perversions of biblical verities, flavored and savored, if they did not save the life of that strange strong spirit. Swing away from Rule teachings as Thomas Carlyle might, he never swung away from the heart of his good father and mother. He lacked Christian feeling just where the lack was in his creed. The "Everlasting Yes" was too much smothered by the nineteenth century No! yet not altogether.

But commoner examples of these same facts abound. I take Dean Stanley to be a representative of a multitude, cultivated but not great, kindly and pleasant towards Christianity, but not in any hearty or deep sense Christian,—who possess amiable impulses which, if they had been taught their own errors instead of a sounder theology, they would not possess, and which none who follow their errors can have. There are popular preachers among ourselves whose printed prayers, (and at intervals, their sermons), express better susceptibilities than their cavils, sneers, and invectives against the beliefs which they began preaching, and against the denominations under whose sanction they first obtained a hearing, would warrant. They speak half in the speech of Ashdod, but half in the Jews' language yet. Their spiritual children are likely to use the former altogether, emitting only paganized thought and sentiment, for these also wax worse and worse. And wherever among the people a cold, watery, sour doubt is diffused and spreading, you will hear denunciations of what has been most surely believed in the churches along with a mild goodish

flavor of kindly Christianity. The biography of Christ is made more of, the less is made of the miracles imbedded in it. His resurrection and that of believers is dwelt on as a hope and a sacred mystery, while there is a vague avoidance of any question as to what is the revealed or possible subject of resurrection from the grave—(body or spirit). Emphasis is laid more heavily on the fearfulness of eternal sin and general responsibility therefor, as a subject of alarm and awe, the more lightly what Scripture saith of judgment, condemnation at Christ's bar, and eternal banishment in Gehenna, as *grounds* of fear to sinners, are touched. An etherialized and shallow love to Christ is cultivated as emotional at long arm's length from any glimpse of this suffering as the propitiation for the world's sins. Men are assured that they must be like Christ, but no conviction as to what this is, is attempted—indeed they are notified that no two persons will have the same idea of it, and each must judge for himself. Christian love towards others is eulogized, minus any reasons therefor, or ground of love; and Christian communion between those who stand on opposite grounds—favorable to Christ and hostile to Him. It is even formulated as a proposition in some quarters that all propositions for or against the truth are entirely immaterial, and are indeed in the way of a right state of heart. Men are to be taken for the feelings they profess, irrespective of what is underneath or behind them.

The able and skillful critic quoted at the outset points out the powerlessness of sympathy with feelings originally begotten by religion, to counteract the unbeliefs or misbeliefs with which such feelings happen to be associated. George Eliot had no objections of sentiment to the precepts and spirit of Christianity, only an utter and insurmountable intellectual objection to Christianity itself as revealed truth, on the logical ground of what seemed to her "want of evidence." "Doubtless," it is said, "the writer who conveyed to so many *unthinking* minds the *poetic beauty* that lies in the faith of a Dinah, impressed on one here and there the force which was transmitted by her glowing sympathies and to which her keen intellect was an absolute non-conductor. But it is *idle*, and worse than idle, it is per-

nicious to confuse sympathy with conviction. This is the temptation of genius; let it be left to those who take the gain with the loss. And let it not be thought that those who honestly mistake the sympathies for the convictions which they *seem* to imply [but do not] are therefore sheltered from the influence of those convictions which they *do* imply. As water must carry with it whatever it holds in solution, so must influence. The critic thinks that if George Eliot's unbelief had been more openly avowed in her fictions, it would have been less mischievous. The bane would have brought out the antidote. But the hidden and stealthy way in which, along with feelings consistent with Christianity, an intellectual hostility to it did its work, made the latter more dangerous both to the intellectual attitude of readers and to these very feelings as not only consistent with Christianity but produced by it. "Perhaps there may be some," adds the critic, "to whom these works have brought nothing but the glow of an emotion, to which their own mind supplied the hidden belief which to them could alone justify it. But on the whole we cannot doubt that *her [own anti-Christian] convictions cut through this sheath of emotion, and made their keen edge felt on many a mind and many a heart.*" The end of so great a writer's influence is not yet, by any means. The real influence, even on her own generation, has not so far come to light. And fewer and fewer hereafter will be those to whom the humanitarianism of George Eliot will be healthy, (being balanced and kept wholesome by a personal Christian belief of their own), while increasing numbers will be hurt by the cold sharp thrust of her unbelief.

So is it with such teachers as we have referred to; so must it be. The survival of feeling when its intellectual foundation has perished, is not a survival of the fittest. For belief is not begotten by sympathy, but sympathy by belief. The natural children of atheism and infidelity are inhuman. Though we have a constitutional foundation for good will and affection toward our fellow beings which is independent, in a sense, of our constitutional moral and religious capacities, and though kindness, sympathy, benevolence even, are not in themselves Christian, but merely natural, they never last long unless Christian char-

acter goes with them and is behind them. The love that has a moral source and keeps company with conscience and spiritual views of man and the universe, is the sure and deep and long-lived love. Unbelief, in due time, kills it. The anti-Christian temper is abnormal, and the liabilities to selfishness in the most kindly of unbelievers are many and ever arising, and these blight easily and any time all the charities that are not growing from the roots of Christian truth and faith. The survival of feeling is not destined itself to survive long. There is no security—even for the humanities—save in the doctrine that is according to godliness. We must add *to faith* virtue, or, as Bengel phrases it, furnish it forth *in our faith*. Our love must "abound more and more in knowledge and in all judgment." Even Christian sympathies run dry when Christ's doctrine runs thin. Dr. A. J. Gordon well says that Christ's direction for a consecrated fervent life "is upward, from the heart to the head." If we would grow in the charities we must "be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding." "There are those," he says, "who would fain eke out a narrow apprehension of His atoning love by a larger admiration of His matchless wisdom. There are those who could cover a criminal ignorance of His word by a parade of fondling phrases and trite endearments of His person. There are those who, letting all the channels of biblical knowledge run dry in their souls, are seeking to irrigate the parched and thirsty heart by revolving the wheel of an endlessly repeated religious experience. But such make-shifts will soon exhaust themselves. There is no way in which the current of love can be strengthened except by deepening the channels of knowledge." A life-long study of Christ is "the only thing which can furnish an inexhaustible stimulant to our affections." In "Christ's most consecrated servants, Edwards, Pascal, Brainard, Howe, you will find that their highest ascents into the regions of spiritual joy and delight were made, not on the wing of the soaring affections, but along the ladder of patient search after God, and in surmounting round after round of the *scala sancta* of revealed truth." Therefore for the sake of the sentiments and charities themselves which literature over exalts in themselves, and as

dissevered from the stem of conviction on which they grow to any purpose, we must insist on these convictions as the principal thing. The branches live only as the stem lives.

It is a profound conviction with me that this is specially needed just now. The exaggeration of these sentiments and charities shows that they have been removed from a spiritual basis to a lower and weaker and precarious one. The dissuasives against even inquiring what their basis is, which are part of the now popular outcry against theology; the insisting that good feeling shall be esteemed, eulogized and stimulated for its own sake alone, and the serious attempt to fasten it to conscience and faith be resisted; the ready and superficial protest: "It is enough if people only have a warm side towards their fellows, no matter what it proceeds from,—away with all inquisition into the motives or foundations of pleasant dispositions and friendly acts,—it is ungracious and meddlesome—what has doctrine to do with the social virtues? These things betray bald, short-lived anti-evangelical humanitarianism in what are called evangelical circles. The pulpit easily yields to them, preaches mere natural feeling instead of the divine life, helps the world "worship any serve the creature more than the Creator,"—does its part to help materialism bring in that kingdom of man which, it is boasted, has now fairly superseded the kingdom of God, and finds itself popular with the unregenerate for so doing. Men will praise thee when thou givest them credit for real goodness of heart *minus* the new birth. It is not necessary altogether to "outgrow prayer and piety, and put culture and science in place of religion," as a late Boston letter says the Parker Memorial Society has done. Sermon and prayer and conference and exhortation can be taken down from the devout and spiritual level instead, and secularized, saturated with mere naturalism; we can talk incessantly of love in the family and among neighbors, in place of love to God. As the life of the heart in all our social relations began first aside from or before any religious convictions, whatever small part of it (through grace) has been connected with such convictions can easily be slipped aside or drawn away from them unaware; and even the

pulpit — whose very business it is, as Christian, to prevent this,—may unconsciously do the chief part of this disastrous work. And therefore the lesson given on the survival of the feelings in George Eliot by "one who knew her," has special truth and timeliness and moment.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE LITURGICAL QUESTION—WORSHIP AND ITS FORMS.

By REV. F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

The term *Liturgic* is derived from the Greek word *leiturgia*, and was used to express the service performed by any public officer. In the New Testament it is employed to express the idea of a service in general, but it is applied in particular to the service performed by the Jewish priests, to the service of Christ as High Priest, and to that of the Apostles in spreading the Christian religion. In the ancient Church it was used to express all that pertained to the public worship of God. We use it still to designate every thing which pertains to the form of worship, whether public or private, every thing which bears upon the manner of worship, of performing religious rites or of administering religious ordinances. The term *Cultus* means culture literally, but is likewise employed by the classic authors to denote worship. As now used, it embraces both ideas, viz: the culture of worship. *Cultus* refers, then, to the nature and characteristics of worship, while *Liturgic* refers to the form, which is followed in the service of the sanctuary.

Inasmuch as the subject of worship and its form, has awakened special interest in the Lutheran Church in this country during the last quarter of a century, we propose adding our mite to the proper decision of the liturgical question.

Luther was not only the father of the Reformation and founder of the Church which bears his name, but he was also the author of its order of worship. "The worship of God," says he, "is of Divine origin, as well as the office of the ministry; but just as the latter has been corrupted through the tyranny of the

priesthood, so too has the former been perverted, through the influence of the hypocrites. And as we do not desire to abrogate the office of the ministry, but to bring it again into its proper position, neither do we intend to destroy the worship of God, but to re-instate it into its original purity. Three great errors have crept into the worship of God. The first, that the word of God was put to silence in the churches, and the whole time of service occupied with reading and singing. The second, that as the word of God was hushed, they introduced in its stead, so many unscriptural fables, lies, legends, songs and sermons, that it is horrible to witness it. The third, that this service was performed in order to merit God's grace and salvation."

Luther prepared his first liturgy, called the *Formula Missæ*, as a directory of worship, for the use of Evangelical churches, in 1523. In the compilation of it, he determined to retain everything in the Romish Mass which was not contrary to the word of God, instead of introducing at once an entirely new order of church service. He regarded the latter course of doubtful propriety, being convinced, than as soon as the Evangelical faith would become living and self-conscious, it would separate from itself every thing foreign to its nature, and cling to that only which accorded with it. In this Service he wished simply to show how far the Catholic order of worship could be safely followed in the Evangelical churches.

The parts of worship, according to the *Formula Missæ* prepared by Luther, were the following :

#### I. THE ORDINARY SERVICE.

1. The *Introitus*. This was the name given to the passage of Scripture sung or chanted as the minister entered the altar. Luther preferred, however, the Psalms themselves, from which they were taken.
2. The *Kyrie*. This consists in the repetition of the petition : Have mercy upon us, O Lord ! Have mercy upon us, O Christ ! Have mercy upon us, O Lord ! It was sung by the choir.
3. *Gloria in Excelsis*. This was also called the Greater Gloria, in comparison with the *Gloria Patri*, called the Smaller Gloria.
4. The *Collect*. This was a short prayer, invoking the blessings of God on the reading of the

Scriptures. 5. The Epistle for the day. 6. *Graduale*. This was a Psalm, which was sung between the reading of the Epistles and the Gospels, while the Deacon was ascending the steps leading to the place for reading the Gospels, after having read the Epistle. The word Alleluia was repeated after it. 7. The Gospel for the day. 8. The singing of the Nicene Creed. 9. The Sermon.

## II. THE COMMUNION.

1. The *Praefatio*. This is the name given to the preface uttered in introducing the celebration of the Lord's Supper. *Minister*—The Lord be with you. *Congregation*—And with thy spirit. *Minister*—Lift up your hearts. *Congregation*—We lift them unto the Lord. *Minister*—Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God. *Congregation*—It is meet and right so to do. 2. The *Consecration* with the *Sanctus* and the *Benedictus*. The *Sanctus* is: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. The *Benedictus* is: Hosannah in the highest, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosannah in the highest. 3. The *Lord's Prayer* and the *Pax Domini*—“Our Father,” &c. “The peace of the Lord be with you always.” 4. The distribution of the Bread and Wine, during which they sang the *Agnus Dei*, which is—Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, give us peace. 5. The *Benediction*. “Let us bless the Lord,” followed by: The Lord bless and keep thee, &c.

Luther adopted the principle, that as no particular Order of Worship was prescribed in the Scriptures, the Church of God had the right from time to time, to adopt such an one as tended to the edification of the people, and to change, alter, or amend the same, as her interests and circumstances might require, so far as the form was concerned, retaining, however, always the substance of worship as contained in the New Testament. Accordingly, he changed and improved the order of worship contained in the *Formula Missæ* in 1526, by preparing his second liturgy, the “German Mass,” the parts of which were as follows:

1. The singing of a spiritual hymn or German Psalm.
2. The Kyrie.
3. The reading of the Collect.
4. The reading of the Epistle.
5. The singing of a German Hymn.
6. The reading of the Gospels.
7. The singing of the Creed Hymn.
8. The Sermon for the Sabbath or Festival.
9. The Lord's prayer paraphrased.
10. The admonition to the Communicians.
11. The Consecration of the Elements.
12. The singing of the words of the institution.
13. The concluding Collect.
14. The Benediction.

We see in this improved Order of Worship, less dependence on the Romish ritual, and greater simplicity according to the established principles of worship, adopted by Luther. It was his intention to prepare a third and still more simple order of worship, minute details of which he had not prepared but whose cardinal points he had marked out, and which Count Zinzendorf adopted in preparing an Order of Worship for the Moravians.

Two great principles which were adopted by Luther and received by the Church that bears his name, must be kept in mind, in order to understand the history of her worship; the first was to adhere to what was old and customary, as far as it could be done consistently with the Scriptures; and the second was to make such changes as seemed to be required from time to time, by the wants of her members. Accordingly, under the influence of the former principle, there was a strong tendency, for more than a century, to make little alteration in the forms of worship, and to retain substantially the same order of devotion. Under the influences of the latter principle, which gradually became stronger and stronger, changes were made from time to time, until at last there was hardly a remnant of the old order of worship left in many of the Lutheran Churches on the continent. According as the one or the other principle prevailed among those who governed the Church, was her form of worship varied in the different countries of Europe, in most of which liturgies were prepared and introduced. During the last half century the liturgical tendency has been revived, and under its influence a considerable number of liturgies have been prepared and introduced into the Churches on the continent.

Examples of this tendency are found in the Prussian liturgy, and in that prepared by the Rev. W. Löhe.

The order of worship contained in the Prussian liturgy, introduced into the United Evangelical Church in 1822, by Frederick William, is as follows :

#### MORNING SERVICE.

1. The opening Hymn. As the last verse is sung by the congregation, the minister rises, approaches the altar, and prays for himself; then turns to the people who rise and stand, while he reads the opening consecration form : In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Our help is in the name of the Lord, who hath made Heaven and Earth."
2. The Confession of sin.
3. The passage of Scripture in the place of the Introitus.
4. The Smaller Gloria.
5. The Kyrie three times.
6. The Greater Gloria.
7. The Greeting : The Lord be with you.
8. The Collect.
9. The reading of the Epistle, followed with the Hallelujah by the choir.
10. The reading of the Gospels, followed with the response from the choir : "Blessed art thou O Christ!"
11. The Creed which is sung.
12. The passage of Scripture after the Creed.
13. The Preface.
14. The General Church Prayer.
15. The Lord's Prayer. The minister now leaves the altar and enters the pulpit.
16. The Principal Hymn, preparatory to the sermon.
17. The Sermon, which begins with either a short prayer or greeting, before the reading of the text, and closes with the Lord's Prayer.
18. The Annunciations.
19. The Benediction, after which the minister leaves the pulpit, and the congregation sings a short hymn.

#### THE CELEBRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. The minister enters the altar, and reads an admonition to the communicants.
2. A short prayer.
3. The consecration.
4. The greeting.
5. The distribution of the bread and wine, during which the hymn, "O Lamb of God," is sung, and the words of the institution are repeated.
6. The concluding prayer.
7. The Benediction, followed with a short hymn by the congregation. This Liturgy contains a more simple and abridged form of worship, which is used where there is no choir, and where the time for the whole service is too short.

A Liturgy, compiled from more than two hundred older liturgies, by the celebrated old Lutheran theologian, Rev. William Löhe, published in Germany in 1844, and designed for the use of the Old Lutheran Churches in Europe and America, presents the following order of worship:

1. Hymn by the congregation.
2. Invocation at the altar.
3. Confession of sin.
4. Introitus, with the Gloria Patri or a hymn.
5. Kyrie.
6. Gloria in Excelsis.
7. Collect.
8. The Epistle and Hallelujah.
9. Gospel, and "Glory be to thee O Lord!"
10. Creed, Nicene, Apostles' or Luther's hymn.
11. Sermon.
12. Prayer.
13. Annunciation.
14. Benediction.

The whole service is interspersed with responses from the congregation, and the forms are as long, if not longer than those of the Episcopal Common Prayer Book. The design of this liturgy is to present a prescribed, uniform, complete and invariable liturgical service.

The first Order of Service used by Lutheran churches in this country was that adopted by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, at its meeting in Philadelphia in 1748. It was prepared by Dr. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, if we mistake not, and is nearly identical with that of Luther in the German mass. The following is a copy, as given by Dr. J. Fry, in his "Church Book Explained:"

**THE ORDER OF PUBLIC WORSHIP AS IT SHALL BE HELD IN ALL OUR CONGREGATIONS.**

1. Hymn of Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

*¶ After the Hymn the Minister shall go before the Altar, and turning his face to the congregation, shall say :*

2. The Exhortation to Confession.

"Beloved in the Lord, &c., &c. Therefore make confession with me of your sins and say thus:"

*Here follows The Confession of Sins, ending with*

*The Kyrie, "Lord God, the Father in Heaven, have mercy upon us," &c.*

*¶ After the Confession shall be sung*

3. The Gloria in Excelsis. (*The metrical version was used.*)

*¶ Then shall the minister say :*

4. The Salutation.

**MINISTER:** The Lord be with you,

**CONGREGATION:** And with thy spirit,

**MINISTER:** Let us pray.

¶And he shall use the Collect appointed in the Marburg Hymn Book for the Sunday or Festival day.

The Collect.

¶After the Collect the Minister shall say: Let us reverently hear

5. The Epistle for the Day.
6. The principal Hymn.

¶Then shall the Minister say: Let us reverently hear

7. The Gospel for the Day.

¶Then shall follow

8. The Creed. (*The metrical form was used.*)

¶Then shall be sung

9. A Hymn. (*Nos. 49 or 50 in the Church Book were the hymns designated to be used here.*)

¶Then shall follow the Sermon preceded by the Exordium, or a Prayer concluding with the Lord's Prayer, during which the congregation shall stand.

10. The Sermon.

¶After the Sermon nothing shall be used except the following General Prayer or The Litany.

11. The General Prayer.

¶After the General Prayer, special prayers (if desired) for the sick, &c., shall be offered, followed by

The Lord's Prayer.

¶Then shall follow the Notices and Appointments, after which the Minister shall say

12. The Votum. "The peace of God," &c.

¶Then shall be sung

13. A Hymn.

14. ¶Then the Minister going before the Altar shall say

MINISTER: The Lord be with you.

CONGREGATION: And with thy spirit.

MINISTER: Let us pray. (*Here follows*)

14. The Closing Collect.

15. The Benediction. "The Lord bless thee," &c.

The first Liturgy of the Lutheran Church in the United States was prepared and adopted by the Pennsylvania Synod in 1786. Prior to that time the fathers of our Church used the liturgies to which they were accustomed in Europe. Its order of worship was as follows:

1. A suitable hymn. 2. The Confession of Sin, concluding with the Kyrie. 3. The Greeting by the minister: "The Lord be with you." 4. The Response by the congregation: "And with thy spirit." 5. Prayer either uttered from the heart, or

read from the Hymn-Book which may conclude with the Lord's Prayer. 6. The reading of the Epistle. 7. The Baptism of Children. 8. The principal Hymn. The minister then leaves the altar and enters the pulpit. 9. The Sermon. 10. A Church Prayer or the Litany, concluding with intercessions for the sick, &c., and the Lord's Prayer. 11. The Annunciations. 12. "The Peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus." 13. A few verses are again sung. 14. The alms are collected. 15. The minister returns to the altar and again greets the congregation: "The Lord be with you," to which they again respond: "And with thy Spirit." 16. A short ejaculatory prayer. 17. The benediction. 18. A doxology.

Inasmuch as country churches could have only one service on Sabbath and Festival days, it was enjoined that the catechisation of the children should take place immediately after the sermon, and before the Hymn and the Benediction, which was not to be neglected at least from Easter to St. Michael's day.

If in town churches there be afternoon service, it shall be conducted after the following order:

1. Hymn.
2. Minister approaches the altar, and calls upon the young to come forward.
3. Utters a short prayer.
4. Examination of the young on the sermon of the morning catechetically.
5. Repetition by the young of a part of the catechism which is then expounded.
6. Hymn by congregation or Catechumens alone. Either the Creed Hymn or another suitable one.
7. Alms.
8. A Collect.
9. The Benediction.
10. Hymn.

If there be a sermon delivered, it may be based upon the Epistle for the day, or another suitable portion of Scripture. If there can be no morning service in town congregations, then the afternoon service shall be conducted as follows: 1. Hymn. 2. Sermon of half an hour's length. 3. Catechisation another half hour. 4. A Collect. 5. Benediction. 6. Hymn.

Prayer meetings were to be short in the towns, and consisted of hymns, prayers, exhortation, and benediction.

This Liturgy continued in use thirty-two years, after which it was superseded by a new and improved edition, published by

the Pennsylvania Synod in 1818. Its order of worship was as follows :

1. Hymn at the Altar. 2. Confession of Sin, concluding with the Kyrie. 3. The Greeting. 4. The Response. 5. The reading of the Epistle, Gospel, or other suitable portion of Scripture. 6. Prayer. 7. Baptism of Children. 8. Principal Hymn. During the singing of this the minister ascends the pulpit. 9. The reading of the Church Prayer, Litany, or the uttering of an extemporaneous one, concluding with, 10. The Peace of God, &c. 11. Hymn. 12. Benediction. It contains a second form of worship, which begins with : 1. Invocation. 2. Hymn. 3. The Te Deum Laudamus. 4. Hymn. 5. Prayer. 6. Sermon. 7. Prayer. 8. Hymn. 9. Benediction.

The next Liturgy, which was the first English one published in this country under the auspices of any Synod, was that of the New York Ministerium in 1824. Its order of worship was as follows :

1. Hymn. 2. Confession of Sin. 3. Reading of the Scripture. 4. Prayer. 5. Hymn. 6. Sermon. 7. Prayer. 8. Hymn. 9. Annunciation. 10. Benediction.

In 1795, Dr. Kuntze translated a German Liturgy into English, for the use of the Lutheran churches worshiping in that language. In 1797, Geo. Strebeck compiled an English Liturgy for the use of the English Lutheran Church in New York city. In 1806, a third English Liturgy was published for the use of the same Church. These were chronologically the first English liturgies used by the Lutheran Church in this country.

In 1832, the General Synod published its first English Liturgy. The order of worship is precisely the same as that of the New York Liturgy just mentioned.

The Lutheran Synod of South Carolina published an English Liturgy with their constitution, about thirty-five years ago, whose order of service was analogous to that of the New York Liturgy.

The third Liturgy adopted by the Pennsylvania Synod was published in 1842 in German. It is much more full than any of those which preceded it. It was translated into English and

adopted by the General Synod. Its order of worship is as follows:

1. Invocation at the Altar. 2. Hymn. 3. Confession of Sin concluding with, 4. The Kyrie. 5. Reading of the Scripture. 6. Hymn—The minister enters the pulpit. 7. Prayer. 8. Sermon. 9. Lord's Prayer. 10. Hymn. 11. Annunciations. 12. Benediction.

It contains also the "Te Deum Laudamus," which can be used at pleasure, on appropriate occasions, such as the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It has a paraphrase of the Creed among the General Prayers for the Sabbath morning worship, and enjoins the use of the Creed in the Baptism of children, and the consecration of a church. The German original is very expressive and devotional. It is, however, difficult, if not impossible to transfer the idiomatic language of devotion from one tongue into another. All that could be reasonably expected in this respect, was done in translating this Liturgy into English, for the use of the Churches of the General Synod; but no one acquainted with the German can fail to notice that the English is inferior to it. And from this fact, it became clear that the General Synod can never expect to furnish its English churches with an acceptable and abiding liturgy, except in the form of an original compilation, and composition in that language.

In 1860, the Pennsylvania Synod adopted a new liturgy, the order of which is as follows:

1. A responsive Introit, concluding with the Gloria Patri.
2. The Confession of Sin. 3. The Kyrie, as a response by the congregation. 4. The Absolution, with its response, Amen.
5. The Gloria in Excelsis. 6. The Greeting, with its response.
7. The Collect and its response. 8. The Epistle and its response.
9. The Gospel and its response. 10. The Apostle's Creed, by an audible and united repetition. 11. The General Prayer, or, 12. The Litany with twenty-two responses. 13. First Litany Collect. 14. Second Litany Collect. 15. Third Litany Collect. 16. The fourth Litany Collect. 17. The fifth Litany Collect. 18. The principal Hymn, during the singing of which the minister enters the pulpit. 19. The Sermon. 20.

The Lord's Prayer by a united audible repetition. 21. The concluding Hymn, during the singing of which the minister leaves the pulpit and returns to the chancel. 22. The Benediction. 23. The Response—Amen!

This Liturgy is a translation of a German one, adopted in 1855. The variations, however, between the German and English editions are numerous and great. We gave it a fair trial as pastor at Lancaster, and while we acknowledge that it contains a number of parts which should belong to a Lutheran order of worship, we are constrained to confess that it is cumbered with others which ought not to have been introduced into it. We found it liable to various objections, drawn from practical experience.

The experiment of inducing a congregation to go through the whole of the service, proved that it could not be done without confusing the people, requiring more attention to the manner of performing their parts, than to the truth which they contained, and creating a spirit of anxiety among the unlearned and timid, rather than a spirit of true and calm devotion among all. The attempt had been made by our predecessor to prepare the people by a regular training to go through this service, and yet its practical result was a failure. They could not be gotten to go over more than one-third of it. Of the twenty-nine responses which they were to repeat, they could not be induced to utter more than two, viz: that of the Greeting and the Kyrie; and the number of those who attempted even this was not more than one in twenty. Of the two parts to be repeated audibly and unitedly, the repetition of but one was attempted, that of the Creed. The number of the people joining was comparatively small, and those who did, did so in subdued tones and trembling voices, rather because they felt that some of them must make the attempt to fill up the part of the congregation, than because they preferred to do so for the purpose of kindling in them the spirit of devotion.

1. We found it too long. The whole service covers about eight pages. We used less than half of it, and it took about half an hour to perform it. It would have required at least forty-five minutes to go through the whole of it. It is fully as

long, if not longer than the service of the Episcopal Church. Its constant use would become exceedingly tedious.

2. We found it too complicated. It is composed of more than fifty different parts, to be used either unitedly, or alternately, by the minister and the congregation. Exclusive of the Litany, it is divided into upwards of thirty parts. We used less than half of those just mentioned, and only about one-fourth of the whole, and still found that the order of worship was not sufficiently simplified. The parts which complicate the service, are comparatively unimportant, and ought to have been excluded.

3. We found the different modes of worship required by the rubrics impracticable. Three different modes of worship are introduced. The first mode is that of performing alternate parts. The whole service requires the minister to perform about thirty parts alone, and the congregation to perform an equal number of parts alone as their response. The second mode is that of a united and audible repetition of parts. The Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer are to be uttered aloud be the minister and the people together. The third mode is that of offering prayer with one accord, the minister leading audibly, and the people following silently.

4. We found it to abound with tautology. The petition, "Have mercy upon us," occurs fifteen times in this precise form during the service, to say nothing of numerous other petitions which contain the same in substance, expressed in different language. It contains so many parts, that it would be difficult to compose them without introducing the same idea more or less frequently. It has nine different prayers including the Litany. Now, let the Litany be excluded, and a general prayer be substituted for it, and we defy any man to offer an extemporeaneous one, without introducing many of the petitions, and much of the substance contained in the eight prayers which precede and follow it. Indeed, it would be no easy task to compose a general prayer, worthy of the name, which would not include many of the sentiments, and even of the petitions, contained in the shorter prayers. Let any intelligent worshiper listen to the injunction of Christ: "Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen

do, for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking," and then ponder an illustration of it, as exhibited by the prophets of Baal, crying out over and over again: "O Baal, hear us!" and immediately afterwards go through this service, and repeat the same petition at least fifteen times in form, and half as many more times in substance, and he could but be impressed with the fear that the authors of that service had not paid proper deference to the command of Christ, nor due heed to the example of the heathen, when they prepared it for use in the churches.

We found it to be cumbered with unnecessary parts. The Greeting may be mentioned as one of them. In itself considered it is harmless, but to constitute it a distinct part of an order of worship, seems to us to be unnecessary. In its use the minister says: "The Lord be with you!" and the congregation responds: "And with thy spirit." But what is here asked in general terms, will be embraced in the silent prayer of both minister and people on entering the church, and be likewise included in the general prayer. If used at all, it should be the first part of the service, and not be introduced into the middle of it. Luther did not retain it in either of his Liturgies, and the American Fathers finding it an incongruity, also dropped it. And in imitation of these examples, none of the Synods which have published English Liturgies in America, introduced it except the Pennsylvania Synod.

The same is true of the Collect. Its original design was to call attention to the reading of the Gospel and Epistle. But many of the Collects are not conformed to this design, and it seems to us altogether unnecessary to introduce a distinct part into the order of worship, for the attainment of this end. The use of the Collects for the Sabbaths and Festivals, as well as the constant repetition of the five Litany Collects contained in the morning service, cannot but involve frequent tautology, and tend to the complication of the order of worship.

The responses to the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel seem to us to belong to the same category. After the reading of the Epistle, the congregation is to respond: "Sanctify us, O Lord, through Thy truth, Thy word is truth!" After the reading of the Gospel, they are to respond: "Praise be to Thee, O

Christ!" They are both unnecessary, because their substance will be contained in other parts of the service. They seem to have been introduced merely for the purpose of filling up the responsive ideal of the compilers. Our people could not be induced to repeat them, and we were necessitated to perform that part of the service for them.

We found several parts which, in our judgment are decidedly objectionable. Such we regard the Absolution added to the form of Confession. The history of Confession and Absolution should make Protestants careful in the manner of using them. We do not object to the use of a suitable form of Confession, nor to the declaration of the promise of God to the truly penitent and believing soul, at the Preparatory Service, but to a formal absolution to be used every Sabbath, we have serious objections. We regard it as unscriptural, liturgically un-Lutheran, and practically liable to make an erroneous impression upon the simple-minded and unlearned hearer. We object, also, to a part of the form in which it is used. It declares that God had pardoned the sins of all the worshipers, without designating in the same sentence the condition upon which this alone could be predicated. It was not retained by Luther as a part of a regular church service, nor is it found in any other Liturgy published by any Synod, ever connected with the General Synod of our Church in this country.

We prefer but one form of Confession for the morning service. Of the two which this Liturgy contains, we regard the first one as too specific and rough. Its sentences are too long, and it is cumbered with synonyms. The second one is free from any of these defects, and is the best form of Confession we have seen. But we prefer the introduction to the first form and have serious objections to the first part of the introduction to the second form. Without explanation, it makes an erroneous impression upon the natural man who will pervert it and expect to be saved by his works, "by doing what is lawful and right." We give the preference to the Apostles' Creed, over the Nicene, and do not regard the use of the Litany, as a proper substitute for the general prayer. And we have come to the deliberate conclusion, from practical experience, that a service like this,

modeled after the ideal of the Romish Mass, does not meet the devotional wants of spiritual Christians, does not accord with the Apostolic mode of worship, and can never be successfully introduced into the churches belonging to the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States.

The Pennsylvania Synod, a few years later, published an English Church Book, in which the Order of Service first presented was considerably modified. This Book of Worship was subsequently adopted by the General Council, a committee appointed by which, subjected its liturgical parts to a thorough revision, and its order of service as contained in a revised edition (1868) is as follows:

1. The introductory sentence by the minister, and the responsive Amen by the congregation.
2. A responsive introduction to confession of sin.
3. The confession of sin, with the response, Amen.
4. The Absolution with the response, Amen.
5. The Introit, concluding with the Gloria Patri.
6. The Kyrie responsively.
7. The Gloria in Excelsis.
8. The Greeting.
9. The Response.
10. The Collect with the response, Amen.
11. The Epistle for the day, with the Hallelujah as a response.
12. The Gospel for the day with its response.
13. The Apostles' Creed.
14. The Nicene Creed.
15. The sermon.
20. The Apostolic Votum, The peace of God, &c., with its response.
21. Hymn.
22. The General Prayer.
23. The Lord's Prayer.
24. The Benediction, with the response, Amen.

It contains about forty distinct parts, thirty-four of which are to be used responsively between the minister and the people; two repeated in concert, and four performed by the pastor alone, the congregation following in spirit. The responses may either be said or sung by the people.

This service differs considerably from that found in the last liturgy of the Pennsylvania Synod, and while we admit that it contains some verbal improvements, it lies open, nevertheless, to the same objections.

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North America published a Book of Worship in 1867. Its order of Morning Service is as follows:

1. The Introit concluding with the Gloria Patri.
2. The

confession of sin, concluding with the Kyrie. 3. The Absolution with the response, Amen. 4. The Gloria in Excelsis. 5. The Apostles' Creed. 6. The Nicene Creed. 7. Reading of the Scriptures. 8. The Decalogue. 9. The General Prayer with the response, Amen. 10. Hymn. 11. Sermon. 12. The Lord's Prayer. 13. The Benediction. The responses are confined to Amen, and the Creed, Commandments, and Lord's Prayer may be repeated in concert.

This service stands in striking contrast with that adopted by the General Council. It is much shorter, less complicated, not cumbered with numerous responses and much more easily followed by the people. It agrees in all material points with that adopted by the General Synod. It contains all the parts of the General Synod's order of worship, with the addition of the Absolution, the Nicene Creed and the Commandments. The only thing in it to which one could object is the Absolution. The Nicene Creed may properly be used instead of the Apostles', and the occasional reading of the Commandments we heartily approve. By their repetition the congregation is brought, as it were, to the foot of Sinai, and hear God speak to them all the words of His law. In it, as before a mirror, the sinner can behold himself, and learn that sin is the transgression of the law, and through it be brought to a knowledge of his sins; and that the law worketh wrath, and thus becomes a schoolmaster to lead him to Christ. And the saint is reminded of the fact, that, although he is not under the law, as a condition of life, but under grace, nevertheless does faith not make void the law as a rule of life, but rather establishes it, and hence he is bound to have respect to all the Commandments of God, that he may prove the reality of his faith in Christ, and the sincerity of his love to his heavenly Father. Luther repeated the Ten Commandments every night before retiring to rest, and then, meditating upon them, fell asleep. They constitute a part of the order of worship of the Episcopal and Reformed Churches, and are contained in the last German Liturgy of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the provisional Liturgy of the General Synod, and the Book of Worship prepared by Dr. Seiss.

The Synodical Conference's "Kirchen-Agende for Congregations of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, composed from the old orthodox Saxon Kirchen-Agenden," is as follows:

1. Hymn.
2. Gloria in Excelsis.
3. Salutation and Response.
4. Antiphons for the season.
5. Collect.
6. Epistle.
7. Sermon;
8. Confession and Absolution.
9. Prayer.
10. Lord's Prayer.
11. Hymn.
12. Sursum Corda.
13. Preface.
14. Sanctus
15. Lord's Prayer.
16. Words of Institution.
17. Agnus Dei
18. Communion.
19. Thanksgiving.
20. Aaronic Benediction.

The importance of having a uniform order of worship in all our Churches cannot well be over-estimated. Its want is very generally felt among us. Its neglect has produced a degree of diversity in conducting the devotional exercises of the sanctuary, found in no other denomination. It ought to be corrected, and an order of worship adopted which can and eventually will be introduced into every Lutheran church connected with the General Synod.

The attempts made lately to furnish such an order of worship have not proved entirely successful, but they have, nevertheless, all contributed something towards the attainment of the ultimate and desired result. Of this character we regard the German and English liturgies of the Pennsylvania Synod, the Church Book of the General Council, the Book of Worship of the General Synod of North America, Dr. Seiss' Book of Worship, as well as the last edition of the General Synod's liturgy, the Provisional Liturgy prepared by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, and the "Order of Service" adopted by the General Synod, and published in its new Book of Worship.

The parts of the Morning Service in the last are as follows:

1. The Introit, concluding with the Gloria Patri.
2. The Confession of Sin, concluding with the Kyrie.
3. The repetition of the Apostles' Creed.
4. The Gloria in Excelsis.
5. The reading of the Scriptures.
6. Hymn.
7. Prayer.
8. Hymn.
9. Sermon.
10. Lord's Prayer.
11. Benediction.

All the parts of this service are found, with scarcely an exception, in every Lutheran liturgy to which we have referred. They are, in themselves, considered most desirable: they meet the spiritual wants of the soul, and their devout and constant

use must tend to kindle the spirit of devotion in the heart of every true worshiper. The history of the several parts of this order of service together with a general criticism we are compelled to defer, for want of space, to the October number.

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN DUTCHESS COUNTY, N. Y.

By REV. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y.

The Lutheran Church in Dutchess County originated from the immigration of the Palatines in 1710, who at first settled the town of Germantown, Columbia county, and afterward spread northward, southward, eastward and westward. (See "The Lutheran Church in Columbia County, N. Y.," in *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, vol. X., pages 33-55.)

Germantown is the most southern town in Columbia county, and with the exception of the German Lutheran church in Poughkeepsie, which is of recent origin, the Lutheran church of Dutchess county is confined to its two most northern towns, Red Hook and Rhinebeck; into which at a very early date after the original immigration the Palatines spread. St. Peter's Church, commonly known as the Stone Church, was the mother church in Dutchess county, and was served until 1815 in connection with the Lutheran church of Germantown in Columbia county; which latter church dates from the period of the immigration.

From St. Peter's Church the Wurtemburg church originated; and subsequently the Rhinebeck church from these two. The congregation at Red Hook was originally a German Reformed church which subsequently became Lutheran. In the village of Pine Plains, in the eastern part of Dutchess and near the Massachusetts line, the Lutherans had a quarter interest in the Presbyterian church, in which Revs. Drs. Quitman and Wackerhagan preached: but it does not appear that at any time there was a regular Lutheran church organization in Pine Plains.

In regard to Lutheran interests in the eastern part of Dutch-

ess county, Mr. Isaac Huntting, of Pine Plains, who has taken a great interest in the early history of that section, writes us: "As early as 1740—perhaps earlier—some Lutheran families settled in what is now the town of Pine Plains, and were instrumental in erecting two churches, one at what is now Bethel, a small hamlet about two miles southeast from the village of Pine Plains—the other about two miles east of Pine Plains, near what is known as the Knickerbocker farm. Services were held in both of these churches, which buildings were simply inclosures—lumber in the rough—with benches for seats. Whether there was ever any organization at either of these places I am unable to say. These buildings have long since been torn down—the early settlers are also long since gone, and their descendants in church membership are merged in the various churches in Pine Plains."

We shall now proceed to give the history of the several Lutheran churches of Dutchess county in their chronological order.

#### I. ST. PETER'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, RHINEBECK.

Services were held in the locality of this church as early as 1723. It is distant about twelve miles from the Lutheran church at Germantown, Columbia county, in the vicinity of which the Palatines settled, in 1710, in four villages. This whole settlement was known as East Camp. A Lutheran minister by the name of Rev. John Frederick Hayer, appears to have been with the immigrants in 1710. Among the original documents of that period, dated Jan. 18th, 1711, is a letter from John Frederick Hayer, minister, stating that he had received forty boards for a school house, from Robert Livingston, and that he desired thirty more to complete it. There is also a petition signed by Mr. Hayer, dated the 8th of October, 1715, petitioning Gov. Hunter, in behalf of himself and sixty Palatine families, for the privilege of building a church in Dutchess county, which was doubtless St. Peter's. How long he lived and served them in the sacred office does not appear. In 1723 Rev. Johannes Spaller was pastor of the churches at Germantown and Rhinebeck. As there are no records of the Germantown church at Germantown until 1746, the pastor must have

resided at Rhinebeck, while he served both churches and kept the record in the book of the Rhinebeck church.

A number of the leaves of the St. Peter's book are missing, and the first baptism in the list, which is marked No. 37, is dated in 1733 and the last one by Mr. Spaller is in 1736, which year seems to have closed his ministry among them. From that time until 1746 there is no record, which would indicate that during that time neither St. Peter's nor Germantown had enjoyed the services of a settled pastor.

In 1746, Rev. John Christopher Hartwick, the founder of Hartwick Seminary, became the pastor of the Rhinebeck and Germantown churches, and he continued to hold that relation until 1758. His record is very accurately kept and very complete, and his services appear continuous. In 1746 he records twenty-eight baptisms, of which six were in Ancram—in 1747 thirty-nine, of which two were in Ancram—in 1748 forty-six, of which two were in Ancram and six in Staatsburg—in 1749 forty-nine, of which two were in Ancram and two in Staatsburg—in 1750 fifty-six, of which ten were in Ancram and one in Staatsburg—in 1751, thirty-one—in 1752, forty-five—in 1753, thirty—in 1754, thirty-three—in 1755, five—in 1756, twenty-seven—in 1757, five.

On account of some difficulty in the church, Mr. Hartwick was absent some time in Pennsylvania, but it does not seem that he relinquished his position as pastor. He states in the record that he returned from Pennsylvania in 1751. He kept a separate record for the congregation at Germantown, which is the beginning of their archives. In the St. Peter's church book is a list of about twenty names of persons to whom he administered the Lord's Supper in Ancram in 1746. Dr. H. N. Pohlman, in his Historical Address at the semi-centennial of Hartwick Seminary, said, that it appeared from his papers that Mr. Hartwick had attempted the building of a Lutheran church in Ancram, (about twenty miles distant,) and that a considerable sum had been subscribed for that purpose, but for some reason the enterprise was abandoned, and a hundred years rolled by before the effort was renewed and consummated.

In his auto-biography, Mr. Hartwick says, "Sent hither a

Missionary Preacher of the Gospel upon the petition and call of some Palatine congregations in the counties of Albany and Dutchess." Columbia county was at that time a part of Albany county, so that it is probable that St. Peter's and Germantown were the first field of labor to which he was called, and this field was early enlarged so as to include Newburgh, N. Y., and New Germantown and Pluckamin in New Jersey. In 1748 he was also for a short time pastor of the Lutheran church in New York City. He was present and helped organize the Pennsylvania Synod in 1748. Yet notwithstanding all these outside toils his labor as pastor of St. Peter's was evidently continuous.

During his ministry in Dutchess and Columbia counties he purchased of the Indians the tract of land in Otsego county, which yielded him the fortune with which he founded Hartwick Seminary. The deed from the Indians was dated May 29th, 1754.

In St. Peter's church Mr. Spaller had baptized 184 children—Mr. Hartwick had baptized 392, and the latter also records 60 marriages and 34 confirmations.

From 1758, the close of Mr. Hartwick's pastorate, until 1760, the church must have had no settled minister. On the 7th of March, 1760, Rev. Johannes Frederick Ries became the pastor and continued his labors until Jan. 5th, 1783. He also served the newly organized Lutheran Church at Wurtemburg, about five miles southeast of St. Peter's, the Germantown church, the Churchtown church, and after it was organized in 1764, the Livingston church in Columbia county, about fourteen miles north of St. Peter's. The first church edifice of the last mentioned congregation was two miles north of the present location, and it was known as the Tarbush church.

Mr. Ries baptized 815 children during his pastorate. At a communion in 1783 one hundred and fifty persons partook of the Lord's Supper. On resigning St. Peter's and the Wurtemburg church, Mr. Ries continued to serve the Lutheran churches of Germantown, Livingston and Churchtown, at which latter place he died in 1791, and his remains were interred in the cemetery there, and his sepulchre is with them to this day.

He was succeeded by Rev. George Heinrich Pfeiffer, whose

first baptism is recorded on the 17th of May, 1784, and the last on the 29th of January, 1798. Mr. Pfeiffer also served the Wurtemburg church during the same period. He was never married. He resigned on account of his mind becoming clouded. He continued to reside in that vicinity until his death. His grave is in the cemetery of St. Peter's church, and the stone bears this inscription: "*Sacred to the memory of Rev. George H. Pfeiffer, a native of Germany, pastor of the Lutheran congregation at Rhinebeck, who died Oct. 26, 1827, aged about 80 years.*" The Minutes of the New York Ministerium show that for many years he received pecuniary aid from that body in his affliction. After his death a balance remaining was voted toward the expense of a tombstone. He baptized 660 children and recorded 338 marriages.

In 1798 the distinguished Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Quitman succeeded to the pastorate in connection with Wurtemburg, Germantown and Livingston. His first baptism is recorded Feb. 18th, 1798, and his last, August 23rd, 1830. He baptized 1520 children and officiated at 708 marriages. He was one of the original Trustees of Hartwick Seminary and the President of the Board from 1816-1828. He also served the Lutheran congregations at Wurtemburg, Germantown and Livingston, and occasionally he preached at Athens in the Dutch language. He was long President of the New York Ministerium.

He died in the parsonage of St. Peter's and was buried in its cemetery. The stone on his grave, a large horizontal slab bears this inscription: "*In memory of Frederick Henry Quitman, D. D., born in the Duchy of Cleves, Westphalia, Aug. 7th, 1760, died at Rhinebeck, June 26th, 1832.*

His family lot also contains the following: "*In memory of William Quitman, M. D., who died Dec. 4th, 1834, in the 47th year of his age.*"

"*In memory of Stephen H. Quitman, born Jan. 22nd, 1796, died Nov. 26th, 1847.*"

"*In memory of Louisa S. Quitman, born in the island of Curacao, Jan. 20th, 1794, died at Kingston, N. Y., Feb. 24th, 1874.*"

"*In memory of Eliza A. Quitman, born at Rhinebeck, July 26th, 1802, died at Kingston, N. Y., Dec. 1, 1880.*"

A tablet in the church to the memory of his first wife shows that she was born on the island of Curacao, and that she died at Rhinebeck, Feb. 24th, 1805, at the age of 37 years. His son, the distinguished Gen. John A. Quitman, was educated at Hartwick Seminary, and after serving as a Professor there, read law, went south, distinguished himself in the Mexican war, and afterward became Governor of Mississippi. Only two of his six or seven children were married—one daughter to a Mr. Quackenbos of Albany, and Gen. Quitman, who left several daughters in Mississippi.

Dr. Quitman married as his second wife a widow by the name of Mrs. Mayer—the mother of Rev. Dr. Philip F. Mayer, of Philadelphia, and Rev. Frederick G. Mayer, of Albany. One of her daughters married Rev. Dr. Augustus Wackerhagen. In 1815 Dr. Quitman relinquished the Germantown and Livingston churches, and was succeeded in that part of his field by Mr. Wackerhagen. In 1825, he also, on account of bodily infirmities, relinquished the Wurtemburg church, where he was succeeded by Rev. William J. Eyer.

In 1828 Mr. Eyer also became pastor of St. Peter's, on account of the infirmity of Dr. Quitman, who toward the close of his ministry had to be carried into his pulpit and who preached in a sitting posture. Mr. Eyer remained until Sept. 1837, when he was succeeded by Rev. Nicholas W. Goertner, who came in 1837, and remained until 1845. At the commencement of his ministry there was a separation of the pastorate, so that it no longer included Wurtemburg. During the ministry of Mr. Goertner the German Reformed church of Red Hook village, three miles north of St. Peter's, became Lutheran, and was added to the pastorate.

Rev. Dr. Charles F. Schaeffer came in 1846 and served the two congregations until 1851, when he was succeeded by Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, who remained until 1860. St. Peter's, during its connection with Red Hook, had only had an afternoon service, and now they resolved upon having the exclusive services of a pastor. They then called Rev. Frederick M. Bird, who served them from 1861–1862; then Rev. George W. Schmucker from 1863–1868; then Rev. Charles Koerner from

1869-1871; then Rev. Sam'l G. Finckel from 1871-1878. On the 19th of May, 1878, Rev. John A. Earnest became pastor, and continues until the present time.

The first church was a log structure, probably built about 1730; in 1723 Rev. Johannes Spaller bought a small farm for himself a little eastward of the church. In 1729 Gilbert Livingston gave them land for a church and cemetery, containing between five and six acres; in 1768 the church bought about thirty acres more. At the present time they own 36 acres, of which 25 acres are arable land. The first burial in the cemetery was in 1733. Barent Zipperly appears to have been a prominent man in the congregation, and a communion box containing the articles necessary for the administration of the Lord's Supper still exists in the possession of the church, marked with the letters "B. Z." and dated 1727.

The second church building, and now still existing, was built of stone in 1780, and tradition says that it was built around and over the former one, which was used for public worship while this was building. In 1824 a handsome spire was added. The parsonage was built for Rev. Dr. Quitman in 1798, and it was largely repaired and also enlarged during the ministry of Rev. F. M. Bird.

St. Peter's is free from debt, has an enrolled membership of 125, has a good church and parsonage, with 36 acres of land, and although circumscribed in her field by her daughters, yet she enjoys a spiritual prosperity under the efficient ministry of Rev. Mr. Earnest. When the division took place, in 1867, in the New York Ministerium, she remained with the Ministerium, but subsequently voted herself independent of synodical connection, which position she still occupies. Her pastor is a member of the New York and New Jersey Synod.

The church is about three miles from the village of Rhinebeck, and four or five from the Hudson river, standing "beautiful for situation," in the midst of charming scenery.

#### II. ST. PAUL'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, WURTEMBURG.

The first organization from which St. Paul's church at Wurtemburg grew, was near Staatsburg; below where the village

of Rhinebeck was subsequently located, and about five miles from the present Wurtemburg church. It was a missionary station on the Hudson river. Subsequently Palatine families found that better lands existed further back from the river and they moved thither. Two of their number, Messrs. Wager and Boltz applied to Henry Beekman, a large land-owner in that section, and the father-in-law of General Lewis, one of the first Governors of the State, for a grant of land to build a church. He replied on the 17th of April, 1759, granting their request for the privilege of building, and in 1774 he conveyed to the trustees of the church nineteen acres, about a mile west from the present location.

They had already built a church and opened a cemetery on two acres of land on the premises of the petitioners, which were deeded in 1785 to the trustees of the church. The original building was probably not a very costly one, for in 1802, on account of its dilapidated condition, they desired to build a new church and obtained leave to sell the nineteen acres, so as to apply the proceeds to the new building. In 1832 it was repaired, and in 1861 it was again repaired and enlarged. Since then the second parsonage has also been built, and the whole church property, nearly free from debt, comprises a good church building with basement, ample sheds, a fine parsonage and a beautiful cemetery. It reports 210 members and is a large and prosperous country congregation, four miles from the village of Rhinebeck and seven from the Hudson river.

Its history has been so closely connected with St. Peter's church, and it had been so long served by the same pastors that we shall merely give the succession of ministers from the beginning until the present time, viz: Rev. Johannes F. Ries, 1760-1783; Rev. George Heinreich Pfeiffer, 1784-1794; Rev. John Frederick Ernst, 1794-1798; Rev. Dr. Frederick H. Quitman, 1798-1825; Rev. William J. Eyer, 1825-1837; Rev. A. T. Geissenhainer, 1838-1840; Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, 1840-1850; Rev. Dr. William N. Scholl, 1850-1855; Rev. George Neff, 1855-1876; Rev. J. G. Griffith, 1876 to the present time.

During the ministry of Mr. Smith a Lutheran church was organized in the village of Rhinebeck, and in 1842 a fine church

and parsonage were erected. As he preached in the forenoon on alternate Sundays in the two churches, and as both churches desired a morning service he relinquished the Wurtemburg church and became pastor exclusively at Rhinebeck.

Dr. Quitman's call required him to preach 18 Sundays and 3 festival days at Rhinebeck—18 Sundays and 3 festival days at Germantown—9 Sundays and 1 festival day at Wurtemburg, and 7 Sundays and 1 festival day at Livingston.

As his salary he was to receive from St. Peter's thirty pounds New York currency, (which was \$75,) ten bushels of wheat, and the use of the parsonage and church lands—from Germantown thirty-five pounds and eight bushels of wheat, fire-wood, and use of parsonage and church lands, or twenty-five pounds additional if he did not choose to use them—from Wurtemburg thirty pounds and eight bushels of wheat—from Livingston twenty-five pounds and eight bushels of wheat.

His call from Wurtemburg had a resolution attached, that he should notice the names attached to the call, and that he should be free from all pastoral duties to those who contributed nothing to the support of the church.

St. Paul's of Wurtemburg is connected with the New York and New Jersey Synod.

### III. ST. PAUL'S EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, RED HOOK.

As has been already remarked this was a German Reformed church, which originated from that portion of the Palatines who adhered to the Calvinistic faith. Their first church building stood below St. Peter's, at what is called Pink's Corners, where an old burial ground shows the location of the church. The baptismal record runs back to 1730. The town of Rhinebeck then extended to the Columbia county line. About the year 1800 the old edifice at Pink's Corners was abandoned and a new church built at Lower Red Hook village, about four miles north of the former location. But the German Reformed church died out gradually—some congregations united with the Dutch Reformed, and this church at Red Hook being largely affiliated with the Lutherans by association and intermarriage, finally, during the pastorate of Rev. Dr. N. W. Goertner at St.

Peter's, became a Lutheran church and has since been connected with that denomination. It represents a wide extent of good farming country, has a large substantial stone edifice, which is stuccoed, a fine parsonage, lecture room, cemetery and ample sheds, and it has an enrolled membership of 305 communicants.

A few years ago the church edifice was largely improved at a cost of \$3,000, and recently a pipe organ costing \$1400 has been added.

On the territory of this congregation are two Lutheran chapels, one at Rock City, about four miles south-east of Red Hook and the other at Barrytown, three miles west and near the Hudson River.

The former was built at the sole expense of John Griffin Schultz, a beloved member of the Red Hook church. At the meeting of the New York and New Jersey Synod in 1872, in Hudson, Mr. Schultz presented the deed of the property to the Synod. It was accepted and the thanks of the body were presented to Mr. Schultz in appropriate resolutions. It was built on the land of the donor and cost about three thousand dollars. The chapel is supplied with preaching by the Lutheran ministers of Red Hook, St. Peter's and Wurtemburg.

The chapel at Barrytown was built by Robert Donaldson and Isabella Donaldson his sister, and after the death of the former, Miss Donaldson at the session of the Synod of New York and New Jersey in 1873 at Red Hook, deeded the Sylvania Chapel, a neat church edifice, beautifully located, to the Synod, which was accepted and appropriate resolutions of thanks were passed by that body to the noble Christian lady who had tendered the gift. Robert Donaldson is buried in the rear of the chapel and on its grounds. The pastor at Red Hook preaches there in the afternoon.

Its succession of Lutheran pastors has been as follows, subsequent to Rev. Dr. N. W. Görtner, viz: Rev. Dr. Charles F. Schæffer, 1846-1851; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1851-1860; Rev. N. H. Cornell, 1860-1864; Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Barclay, 1865-1868; Rev. W. H. Luckenbach, 1869-1872; Rev. Thomas T. Everett, 1872-1875; Rev. Dr. G. F. Stelling, 1875-1877;

Rev. J. Q. McAtee, 1877-1879; Rev. S. A. Weikert, 1879 to the present time.

This Church is connected with the New York and New Jersey Synod.

#### IV. THIRD EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, RHINEBECK.

Members of St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and other Lutheran churches, gradually made the village of Rhinebeck their residence. When Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith became pastor of the Wurtemburg church in 1840, they had no parsonage and he resided in the village of Rhinebeck as his predecessors had done. He preached in the morning in the Wurtemburg church and in the evening in the Baptist church in the village. It was at length resolved to organize a Lutheran congregation and build a Lutheran church. John T. Schruyver donated a fine lot, and the church was erected at a cost of \$5,500. Subsequently land was bought of Mr. Schruyver adjoining the church and a parsonage erected.

The whole property has been paid for—the number of members is about 120 and the enterprise has been a success. The corner stone bears the figures "1842" as the date of the erection of the church. Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, the founder and first pastor, continued to serve both Wurtemburg and Rhinebeck until 1850, when the former church determined to have the exclusive services of a pastor, and Mr. Smith remained a year longer at the village church, and then went to Easton.

Its succession of pastors is as follows: Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, 1842-1851; Rev. Dr. John McCron, 1851-1854; Rev. J. W. Hessler, 1854-1855; Rev. Jacob H. Heck, 1855-1858; Rev. Ernest Lubkert, 1858-1861; Rev. W. H. Luckenbach, 1861-1865; Rev. Reuben Hill, 1865-1870; Rev. Henry L. Ziegenfuss, 1871-1873; Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, 1873 to the present time.

In 1867, on the formation of the New York Synod, the Rhinebeck church remained with the New York Ministerium, from which it subsequently withdrew and has since had no synodical connection.

## V. FIRST EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN GERMAN CHURCH, POUGHKEEPSIE.

In the later immigration of the Germans of the last fifty years, a number came and settled in Poughkeepsie, the county town of Dutchess, and now a city of over twenty thousand inhabitants. In the year 1847, the German residents of Poughkeepsie held a religious meeting in the Village Hall, which drew together Lutherans, Roman Catholics and Methodists. Rev. Mr. Doerstein preached, but after holding services for several Sundays it was discovered that he was a Methodist, when the Lutherans withdrew and secured the basement of the Reformed church and were served by Rev. Gustavus H. J. Derkston, who was a licentiate of the New York Ministerium. His license was not renewed and he disappeared. On Feb. 14th, 1850, Rev. E. H. Schluster became their pastor and remained until 1852, when he accepted a call to Williamsburgh, Long Island. Rev. Augustus Schmidt succeeded him and remained until 1856. Up to this time they had worshiped in the lecture room of the Reformed church which was now destroyed by fire. Then the lecture room of the Episcopal church was secured, and their pastor accepted a call to Williamsburgh. Rev. J. Hoffman, of Rome, succeeded, who organized them under the name of "The First Evangelical Lutheran German Church of Poughkeepsie."

Then they hired the Universalist church for services, and an effort was made to secure a church property of their own, but it failed. In May 1857, Mr. Hoffman resigned. Then a Mr. Wilkinson came along and offered his services as pastor, but his life developed irregularities and the members were very much discouraged. In 1858, Rev. G. Manz, a licentiate of the New York Ministerium, became pastor, when a large stone house was purchased and the lower part fitted up for church purposes at an expense of \$1500. In April 1860, Mr. Manz resigned and was succeeded by Rev. Augustus A. H. Schubert. He resigned the next year. In October 1860, Rev. C. H. Siebke, of Rondent, accepted a call, when they abandoned the purchased property, which proved burdensome, and again rented the Universalist church.

In 1864 a lot, 76 by 106 feet, was purchased on Grand street

for a church building. In Dec. 1865, Rev. Mr. Siebke resigned. In Jan. 1866, Rev. Frederick Von Rosenberg accepted a call, and on the 13th of June the corner-stone of a church edifice was laid, and on the 14th of Nov. Rev. Dr. H. N. Pohlman, President of the New York Ministerium, dedicated a fine brick church which cost \$8,000, with but \$2,500 of debt remaining. In April 1869, Mr. Von Rosenberg resigned, and was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Busse, who remained until Sept. 1874, when he was succeeded by Rev. Mr. Hoeck, who in turn resigned in July 1878.

During the ministry of Rev. Mr. Hoeck many of the members felt the necessity of English preaching and with the consent of their pastor, Rev. George Neff, who had moved from Wurtemburg to Poughkeepsie, preached for them in the English language every Sunday evening for nearly a year, ending Sept. 1877, when on account of difficulties between the pastor and people, English preaching was discontinued. Mr. Hoeck resigned in July 1878, and the next month he was succeeded by Rev. G. G. Berkmeier, who is now laboring successfully among them. He preaches in the English language once a month. The debt is reduced to \$1500, and gradually decreasing—there are 130 members of the church and 150 children in the Sunday School.

This church is in synodical connection with the New York Ministerium.

Dutchess county has furnished the following Lutheran ministers :

REV. JOHN D. ENGLISH.

Mr. English was born on the 3d of April, 1827, in the town of Red Hook, about three miles from the village. His father, Thomas English, came from Ireland when a young man, and he was a friend of the widow of Gen. Richard Montgomery and a witness of her will. His mother, Gertrude Like, was of German origin and the daughter of a revolutionary patriot. Mr. English was baptized by Rev. Dr. F. H. Quitman. In 1846, under the direction of Rev. Dr. N. W. Goertner, he went to Hartwick Seminary to prepare for the ministry. In 1849 he entered Williams College, but finding the expenses too great

for his means, he entered Auburn Seminary and commenced the study of theology. During the summer vacation in 1852 he supplied the Lutheran Church at Waterloo, and in September of the same year he was licensed by the New York Ministerium, which met at Red Hook. Soon after he accepted a call to Christ Evangelical Lutheran church at Ghent, N. Y.

In February, 1853, he married Susan Adeline, daughter of Rev. Dr. Geo. B. Miller of Hartwick Seminary. Five children are the result of this union, all of whom survive. On the 6th of Sept., 1853, he was ordained at the meeting of the New York Ministerium at Rhinebeck. In June, 1854, he became pastor of the Lutheran Church at Middleburgh—in 1858 he accepted a call to the Lutheran Church at Fayette, Seneca Co. In September, 1862, he was commissioned by Gov. Morgan a line officer in the 148th Regiment of N. Y. Volunteers. This body was in the Army of the Potomac and stationed at Norfolk and Suffolk, Va. Prostrated by typhoid fever, in the spring of 1863 he resigned his commission, went home, recovered his health, and reentered the army in 1864, and in the following winter was with the 6th Corps in front of Petersburg. He was mustered out July 12th, 1865. In 1866 he was pastor of the Lutheran Church at Lunenberg, Nova Scotia; in 1867 he served the Lutheran Church at Salem, Pa.; in 1869 and 1870 he supplied a Presbyterian Church in the vicinity of Hartwick Seminary; in 1870 he united with the Presbytery of Albany and accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church of West Fayette, Seneca Co., where he remained four years. Since then on account of a throat difficulty he has been engaged in agricultural pursuits and now resides at Waterloo, Seneca Co., N. Y.

REV. IRVING MAGEE, D. D.

Mr. Magee was born in the village of Red Hook, Dutchess Co., of parentage reaching back to the earliest settlement of that region. His father's father was of Scotch-Irish descent, his other ancestors of German origin. In his early boyhood his father moved to the town of Livingston, Columbia county, where he reared his family and gave them the best attainable village education.

The subject of this sketch in his seventeenth year began to teach a district school, first in the country and then in the village of Clermont, where he boarded with Rev. Dr. Augustus Wackerhagen. At this time application had been made, with prospects of success, for a cadetship at West Point; but his attention was turned to the gospel ministry, and in 1850 he went to Hartwick Seminary to prepare for college. In 1857 he graduated from Williams College. He then became Principal of Spencertown Academy, prosecuting his theological studies at the same time, so that a year later he took the second year in theology at Hartwick Seminary and subsequently spent the third in Union Seminary.

In May, 1860, he became pastor of the Lutheran church at Valatie, where he had preached from the preceding November under an *ad interim* license. He remained there until September, 1865, having added about 150 members to the church, when he became pastor of the Lombard Street church, Baltimore, Md., where he remained until Jan. 1st, 1868, having added about 100 members. He then labored a year as pastor of the Lutheran church in Chambersburg, Pa., where about 100 members united with the church under his ministry. In February, 1869, he settled at Dayton, Ohio, and remained there until November, 1872. While in Dayton there was a great religious awakening in the city, and 336 persons united with the Lutheran church. From Dayton he removed to Albany and became pastor of the Lutheran church there, which he still serves and where 294 have been added to the membership.

In June, 1872, Wittenberg College conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

#### REV. WILLIAM EDWIN TRAVER.

Mr. Traver was born Jan. 24th, 1847, in the town of Clinton. His parents were Martin and Catharine Traver, who were descended from the Palatines who originally settled that region. He was baptized in infancy by Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, who was pastor of the Wurtemburg Lutheran church at that time.

When seventeen years of age he was confirmed by Rev. Geo.

Neff of the same church. Feeling called to the work of the gospel ministry, in the autumn of 1866 he went to Hartwick Seminary and spent three years in classical study. Owing to the death of Dr. Miller and the suspension of the theological department for a time, until another Professor could be secured, he went to Gettysburg and entered the theological seminary there and graduated in 1873. He was licensed *ad interim* in April of the same year by Rev. Dr. H. N. Pohlman, President of the New York and New Jersey Synod. In the autumn he was licensed by that Synod at its meeting in Red Hook, and in 1874 he was ordained at its annual meeting in St. James church, New York City.

In the summer of 1873 he supplied the pulpit of the Lutheran church at West Camp until their new pastor, Rev. Levi Schell, could come. He declined a call to Reedsburg, Ohio, and in November settled as pastor of the Lutheran church at West Amsterdam, N. Y., where he labored four and a half years and then accepted a call to Zion's church, Athens, N. Y., where he is now successfully laboring.

In September, 1873, he married Miss Melissa Adelaide Love of Rondout, N. Y., by whom he has one child.

REV. CHESTER H. TRAVER.

Mr. Traver was born in the town of Clinton, Dutchess county, June 23rd, 1848. His ancestors on both sides were Germans, coming from Wurtemburg, in Germany. His father was Gideon A. Traver, one of the most esteemed laymen in the Lutheran Church in that section, and frequently a delegate of his church to Synod. He was baptized in infancy by Rev. Dr. Charles A. Smith, then pastor of St. Paul's church, Wurtemburg. He was confirmed Nov. 12, 1865, by Rev. George Neff. He spent two winters in study at the Institute in the village of Rhinebeck.

In 1867 he entered Hartwick Seminary and prepared for college. In 1870 he entered the Sophomore Class of Pennsylvania College, and graduated from that institution in 1873. He then spent a year in teaching at Hartwick Seminary as Assistant of Prof. Pitcher, at the same time pursuing theologi-

cal studies. In 1874 he entered the Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., and graduated in 1876. In Oct. 1875 he was licensed by the New York and New Jersey Synod at Clarksville, N. J.

In July 1876 he became pastor of the recently organized Lutheran church at Chatham Village, N. Y., but owing to the stringency of the times and the inability of the church to support a pastor, after fifteen months labor there, he received and accepted a call to the Lutheran congregation at Spruce Run, N. J., where he is now successfully laboring.

In September 1876 he married Miss Ida E. Jones, of Gettysburg, Pa., by whom he has had two children. In Oct. 1879, he became associated in the publication of *The Philocrat*, a prohibition paper, published at Clarksville, N. J., near his home; one editor being selected from each denomination in the vicinity.

We acknowledge ourselves under obligations to Rev. Dr. William D. Strobel, Mr. Edward N. Smith and Rev. J. A. Ernest, of Rhinebeck, and Rev. George Neff, of Poughkeepsie, for the valuable aid they have afforded us in securing the information embodied in this article.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### PRIVATE CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION AS TAUGHT BY THE LUTHERAN SYMBOLS.

By REV. L. A. FOX, A. M., Waynesboro', Va.

The Lutheran Confessions are peculiar among Protestant symbols in giving a distinct place to the subjects of private confession and absolution. The only exception among those now held, we believe, is that of the Reformed Episcopal Church. Not so much interest is felt just at this period among Lutherans in these subjects as among members of the Episcopal Church, yet the misrepresentations of the doctrines of the Confessions that have been and most probably will be made again, and the inherent importance of these doctrines will never allow Lutherans to be indifferent to them. The Lutheran Church does not hold a doctrine concerning Private Confession essentially different from the great Protestant family, but its doctrine of Absol-

lution is one of those distinctive of Lutheranism. Concerning Private Confession it is not Romish, but Protestant. Concerning Absolution it is neither Romish nor Reformed, but peculiar,—its doctrine being properly distinguished by being called Lutheran. A Church dare not be indifferent to those things which are fundamental in her faith without loosing her identity.

But the time is not very far distant when the interest not only among Lutherans, but all Protestants, will be greatly quickened. Some speak lightly of the growing influence of Rome in our country. The indications to the observant, however, are not uncertain of a great contest impending here in America between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. One of the first points called into controversy will be that of the confessional. It is already being agitated in prominent circles. Not long since there were covert attempts to introduce it into some Episcopal congregations in one of our large cities in the east. One of the tests of the presence of the Romish spirit is the views held concerning it. Dr. Morgan Dix in his recent catechism teaches a doctrine which Dr. R. H. McKim says "naturally and logically leads to *auricular confession*, and that not merely as a resort in certain cases, but as a thing practically indispensable." The authors of the Reformed Episcopal Creed thought the danger sufficiently great to make priestly absolution the subject of a special article. Into this contest between the Roman and Protestant spirits Lutherans will certainly be drawn; at first, it may be, as mere witnesses to give testimony, but at length as combatants.

All parties are agreed that sins must be confessed to God, publicly in the general service of the sanctuary, privately in social and domestic worship, and secretly in the devotions of the closet. About this there has never been any question. They are agreed, also, that under some circumstances confession must be made to men. It is the universal custom to admit no one to the sacraments unless he makes a confession to the authorities of the church. Those under suspension or excommunication are never restored to the fellowship of the church without such a confession. In these respects there are essentially the same ideas and practice in all parts of the Church.

The difference is concerning the confession made privately to a minister and the nature of the absolution pronounced by him.

The Lutheran Confessions clearly and unmistakably teach that private confession is important. "Concerning confession they teach that private absolution be retained in the churches, though enumeration of all offences be not necessary in confession." Augsburg Confession Art. xi. "Confession and absolution shall by no means be abolished." Smalcald Articles, Part III., Art. VIII. "It would therefore be contrary to the will of God to abolish absolution in the churches." Apology, Art. iv. In the Latin of Melanchthon the language is still stronger: *Quare impium esset ex ecclesia privatam absolucionem tollere.*

The authors of these Confessions meant by private confession a confession made in the presence of a minister, or of one who was acting for the time being in the capacity of a minister. The Smaller Catechism uses repeatedly the words *minister verbi*. But this confession was not to be made to the minister, but *in the presence of* the minister to God. This was the form put by Luther into the mouth of one confessing: "I, a miserable sinner, confess myself before God guilty of all manner of sins, in particular I confess in the presence of thee," &c.

There can be little doubt that private confession at that time was to a certain extent a specification of sins. This is evident both from the reasons why it was retained and the form of confession given in the Catechism. "In particular, I confess that I, alas! serve my master or mistress unfaithfully." It was a statement of such sins as weighed most heavily upon the conscience, yet when no particular sin could be mentioned a general confession was sufficient. "You need not come," says the Larger Catechism, "and declare how pious or wicked you are; if you are a Christian, I know it well enough otherwise; if you are none, I know it still more readily." As practiced among the Lutherans it afforded an opportunity to unburden the conscience by confessing by name any sin one desired, but all such statements were optional.

The Confessions are equally clear upon the purposes for which private confession was retained.

1. As a preparation for the Holy Supper. The Augsburg

Confession, Art. xxv., says: "For it is not usual to communicate the body of our Lord except to those who have been previously examined and absolved." The Apology, Art. *De Ecclesia*, says: "Concerning the time [of confessing] many in our churches use often in the year the sacraments, absolution and the Holy Supper." The Larger Catechism says: "But if you despise it, and go on haughtily without confessing, we conclude that you are no Christian and that you should not enjoy the sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

2. As a means of instruction. Melanchthon wrote in the Apology: "We approve confession and think that a certain examination is profitable that men may be better instructed."<sup>\*</sup> The German, from which we have our English translation, is stronger: "For we retain confession, and assert it necessary to question youth and inexperienced people for the purpose of affording opportunity to give them the better instructions." The Smalcald Articles state this purpose clearly: "Confession and absolution shall by no means be abolished in the church, especially on account of untutored youth,<sup>†</sup> in order that they may be examined and instructed in the Christian doctrine."

3. As a means of discipline. This, however, was distinct from the ancient ceremonies of public penitence, which they mention but not to endorse. "Those in former times," says the Apology, "who lived in open vice were not reinstated without public ceremonies and reproofs. The Fathers were unwilling to receive those again who were found in open vices without reproof. And there were many reasons for this. Because it served to show that open vices shall be punished. And it was likewise improper to permit those who had fallen into public sins, immediately to approach the sacrament of the Lord's Supper without examination. All these ceremonies have long since been discontinued, and it is unnecessary to reestablish them because they contribute nothing to reconciliation before God."

But this private confession was an examination by which to determine the qualification of applicants for the Holy Supper.

<sup>\*</sup>Hase's Concordia, p. 183.

<sup>†</sup>Propter juvenem indomitam et petulanter.

The sacrament was not given to those who had not been "examined." Those who refused to confess were excluded. Pastors used it also as an opportunity for administering rebukes and warnings. The idea of penance was altogether excluded from the discipline, and was in this respect unlike that of the Fathers, but, as a guide in the administration of the sacraments, the Confessions approved private confession.

4. As a means of consolation. This was the purpose most emphasized. The Augsburg Confession Art. xxv. concludes with these words: "Nevertheless on account of the very great benefit of absolution, as well as for other uses of the conscience, confession is retained among us." This is one of the two uses specified by the Smalcald Articles. "Confession and absolution shall by no means be abolished, especially on account of weak and timid consciences." The Larger Catechism says: "If from some special cause we become disturbed with restless anxiety and find our faith insufficient, we can make our complaint to a brother in this private confession and obtain his advice, comfort and support whenever we desire." The Apology speaking of this matter says: "This doctrine, which is so necessary, has afforded great consolation to the conscience of afflicted individuals."

No one can read with any degree of care the earlier Lutheran Confessions and not be impressed with the importance which they attach to consolation. There were two reasons for this. One was the profound sympathy of their authors with those under the terrors of an awakened conscience. Personal experience taught them this. Melanchthon said in the Apology: *Multi sunt boni viri, quibus hæc dubitatio morte acerbior est.* They availed themselves therefore of every proper means of affording comfort. But there was more than sympathy. They believed that true peace with God evidenced itself in peace of heart. One of their most frequent arguments against the doctrines and practices of Rome was that consciences were distressed, or were not comforted. They held that truth bears witness to itself by comforting the heart. With them a man in doubt was a man without God. "And when men always and perpetually continue in such doubt they never experi-

ence what God, what Christ or what faith is; and they ultimately die in despair without God and without any knowledge of Him." With such results from the doctrine of confession as held at Rome they did not hesitate to call it infamous. "Such is the infamous doctrine of our adversaries—a doctrine which is calculated to abolish the Gospel, to reject Christ, and finally to lead persons into despair, feeling the pain and grief of their consciences when temptations arise." But private confession was a means of administering comfort, the place of which could not be supplied, and this made them retain it. The Variata must be taken as a competent witness of a fact in regard to this subject. In it the idea of the xxv. Article was not changed but expanded. Since by this faith we are consoled amid these terrors and certainly obtain remission of sins, and our souls conceive this faith from the Gospel, likewise from absolution, which announces and applies the Gospel to alarmed consciences, therefore our men teach that private absolution must be retained in the Church." Private confession was a means of consoling the awakened and distressed which had received the divine blessing and until something better could be found they held it contrary to the will of God to abolish it. This, and nothing more, was meant by Melanchthon when he wrote that it would be impious to take it away—a sentiment to which no Christian could hesitate to subscribe.

The ends sought by the Lutheran Reformers were unquestionably good. There is but one opinion about the need of some preparation for a profitable use of the Holy Supper. Lutherans, in common with many others, have a special preparatory service. There is a growing conviction of the necessity of instruction in establishing and developing a piety that rises above the mere emotional into a fixed religious principle. The importance of discipline in this day, when it is so difficult to administer it, is not sufficiently felt, yet it is generally admitted. No one will think of denying the comforts of the gospel to those truly awakened, and if the Reformers did not unduly magnify peace of conscience, consolation is an essential element of true piety. Even if we disapprove their means, the pur-

poses for which they retained private confession were beyond all question eminently desirable.

Private confession, as a means to these ends, had in the time of the Reformation an importance which it has long since lost. It was then an established custom. The people were brought up under the influence of the Confessional. They were taught from childhood to confess their sins to the priest. With all its terrors, the Confessional held its place for centuries because it met a want of human nature. It is natural to desire to tell our griefs to a sympathizing friend, and it is a relief to confess a sin that weighs heavily upon the heart to some one in whom we can confide. The people were accustomed to unburden their consciences at the Confessional. The abolition of private confession would have done great violence to the cravings of the heart. Their condition, created by habit, demanded a private confession to a minister. The conservative principle of the Lutheran Reformation retained all established customs not in themselves contrary to the Gospel. Private confession stripped of its legal elements was not only not wrong but useful, therefore it was *retained*. The truly pious were not only willing but asked to make it. Luther said, "If you are a Christian you need neither my constraint nor the Pope's command at all, but you will indeed importune and entreat me that you may become a participant in the precious and consolatory confession." Again, "If you were a Christian you should be glad to embrace the opportunity of going even a hundred miles or more to make confession, and not permit yourself to be compelled, but come and urge us." The Christian heart in that day, when under distress, turned so naturally to private confession that Luther did not regard one as a Christian who had no desire for it. The custom was so fixed that it could not be ignored. Even Zwingli in his Sixty-seven Articles makes it the subject of the Fifty-second article: "Confession which is made to a priest or neighbor is not to be made for the remission of sins but for consultation." The First Helvetic Confession of the year 1536, does not mention repentance and conversion, and therefore does not speak of Confession, but the Second Helvetic says, "If any,

oppressed by a weight of sin and distressing trials, wishes to seek counsel, instruction and consolation privately from a minister of the Church or any other taught in the law of God, we do not disapprove." The Lutherans did not wish to ignore or abolish, but gladly availed themselves of a custom through which they could accomplish so much good. There is no faithful pastor who would repel a man desiring to make known his sins to him. On the other hand he seeks to elicit from his flock plain and frank statements of their trials. Only those who are ignorant of the reasons for the retention of the custom, or desire maliciously to find fault with the Confessions, can object to their strongest remarks concerning private confession.

The "ought" of the Augsburg Confession in this matter is therefore only relative. The ends are to be sought everywhere and always, but private confession as a means may be changed. The Confessions do not make it binding on us. The Lutheran Reformers would not have introduced it into a community where it was unknown. The Lutheran Church has never made it a test of fellowship. Dr. Schmucker says that in Sweden and Denmark it was "always rejected,"\* but we know there has been no breach of harmony with other parts of the Church on that account.

Between the private confession of Lutherans and the auricular confession of Roman Catholics there were points of similarity. In both there was a confession made privately to a minister in which there was generally a specification of sins, and in both the minister pronounced words of absolution. Private confession took the place of auricular confession. Because of this similarity, enemies of the Confessions have charged them with teaching a Romish error. But private confession, as explained by the Confessions, is essentially different from auricular confession.

1. In the enumeration of sins. Nothing concerning private confession is more clearly specified and more frequently repeated than that it is not necessary to enumerate the sins. It is need-

---

\*Lutheran Symbols Vindicated, p. 103. This statement is not strictly correct.

less to cite passages. They teach that it is enough to make a general confession. Luther said in the Smaller Catechism, "But if thou art unconscious of any sin (which however is almost impossible,) mention none in particular, but receive the remission after having made a general confession to God in the presence of the minister."

But the Roman Catholic Church holds that it is necessary to enumerate the sins. It was made a law by Innocent III. in 1215, in his bull: *Omnis utriusque sexus*.

2. In their authority. The Confessions teach that there is no divine command for private confession. The Augsburg Confession, Art. xxv., quotes, as a proof that it is not necessary to enumerate sins, the *Glossa in Decretis de Penitentia*, which says, "Confession is not commanded in the Scriptures, but was instituted by the Church." The Larger Catechism says, "For this confession [private] is not embraced in a command, like the other two, but is left optional with every one who needs it, to use it to his necessity. And it derives its origin and authority from the fact that Christ himself has placed and committed the absolution into the mouth of His Christian community to release us from sin." This has been the faith of the Church from the beginning. Chemnitz concludes a long investigation of the question, Is confession of divine authority? with these words: "These things cannot be clearly shown and proven either from the Scriptures or the Fathers."<sup>\*</sup> Quenstedt says, "The private confession of sins before a priest to obtain forgiveness has no sure divine warrant."<sup>†</sup> But it is unnecessary to cite authorities. No intelligent Lutheran has ever believed that it had any divine authority. But the Romish Church teaches that auricular confession has a divine right. The Canons of Trent of the Fourteenth Session repeatedly asserts the *jure divino*. Canon vi. says, "If any one denieth, either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right; or saith that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, which the Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and

\**Examen, De Confessio, Part II.*    †*Schmid's Dogmatics.*

command of Christ and is a human invention; let him be anathema." Canon VII. affirms that it "is necessary of divine right for the remission of sins to confess all and singular mortal sins." Canon VIII. pronounces anathema upon all who say that the confession of all sins is only human tradition.\*

3. In not being judicial. The Apology says, "Absolution is not a new jurisdiction to investigate sins, for God is judge." Again, "The power of the keys is not a power to establish particular punishments or services to God." The Lutheran Church has never used it as the Romish Church did the confessional.

The Canons of Trent very plainly make it judicial. The Ninth Canon of the Fourteenth Session says: "If any one saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, let him be anathema." Chapter VI. of the same session says: "But although the absolution of the priest is the dispensation of another's bounty, yet it is not a bare ministry only, whether of announcing the Gospel or of declaring that sins are forgiven, but is after the manner of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as by a judge." This was one reason that they required the enumeration of sins: "They said," as Chemnitz states, "that no judgment can be rightly exercised in unknown causes. Therefore all sins, one by one, must be enumerated, set forth and uncovered to the priest, as to a judge, in confession when absolution is sought." It was analogous to the investigation of civil courts, Chemnitz having said that the Council of Trent not obscurely sets forth this idea of civil processes, adds: "This doctrine manifestly, and as if *ex professo*, contradicts the the doctrine of Christ. For He does not command to announce the remission of sins, provided they see in the penitent a satisfaction for sins, but He commands that the remission of sins be preached in His name."

4. In not being connected with satisfaction for sin. This was the fundamental difference. There can be no question about auricular confession being in the Romish Church the means of expiation. With the Fathers it was an evidence of true contrition, and some regarded it as in itself a satisfaction

---

\*Smets' *Councilii Tridentini*.

to the Church. But Rome lost sight in a large measure of the original design and converted it into the means of imposing satisfactions. An essential part of repentance in the Romish system is satisfaction, and the priest having heard the sins as a judge determines the penalties. This is the great purpose. The Council of Trent condemned the doctrine that it was intended for instruction and consolation. With this idea the Lutheran Confessions are in direct conflict. Two things cannot be more diametrically opposed than the fundamental ideas of Romanism and Lutheranism upon this point, and in whatever respects private confession among Lutherans and auricular confession among Romanists may be alike in form, they are wholly distinct in nature. So different are they that for a long time it has been customary to call them by different names.

With private confession was connected private absolution. Private absolution is absolution given privately to an individual. In this respect only it differs from public absolution, except in the mere accidental form of administration, as the imposition of hands, etc.

Concerning Absolution, the Confessions teach,

1. That God alone forgives sin. "The people are diligently instructed with regard to the comfort afforded by the words of absolution and the high and dear estimation in which it is held; for it is not the voice or word of the individual present, but it is the word of God, *He who forgives sins*, for it is spoken in God's stead and from His command." Augsburg Confession Art. xxv. "Thus observe then, as I have frequently said, that confession comprises two parts. The first is our work and act, to lament on account of sins, and desire consolation and renovation of soul. The other is a work which *God does*, who through the word (placed in the mouth of man) absolves me from my sins, which is the chief and the noblest thing, rendering it lovely and consolatory." Larger Catechism. The Apology teaches in perfect accordance with this that "absolution is merely a command to announce the remission of sin, and is not a new jurisdiction, for God is judge." This is the fundamental idea in the following passage: "Thus God imposes pains and punishments on certain sins for an example, and with these pun-

ishments the power of the keys has nothing to do, but it is the part of God alone to impose them and to remit at His own pleasure." The Confessions not only assert but constantly assume this as an undeniable principle, that no one "can forgive sins save God only." The Lutheran Church has never believed or taught the contrary. No Lutheran "was ever such a consummate fool as to believe anything else." Authorities are unnecessary, but the words of Baier may be quoted: *Certum est, auctoritatem et potestatem ipsam, peccata remittendi formaliter non esse, nisi, ejus, qui Deus est.\** The charge, whether open or insinuated, that Lutherans believe that ministers forgive sins is a slander. All arguments to prove that God only can forgive have no bearing whatever against our Confessions.

2. That absolution is an annunciation of the remission of sins. The Apology says: "Absolution is merely a command to *announce* the remission of sins." "The power of the keys *announces* to us the Gospel through absolution for the words of absolution *announce unto us peace.*" The Larger Catechism says: "But we admonish you to confess and make known your need, not in order that you may do it as a work, but that you may hear what God permits to be *declared* to you, the word, I say, or the absolution, you should consider and esteem great and precious, receiving it with all due honor and gratitude as an excellent and noble treasure."

3. That absolution is the Gospel. So the Apology asserts in so many words. "Absolution is nothing else but the Gospel." "When we hear the absolution, that is the promises of divine grace, or the Gospel, our hearts and consciences are soothed." "Absolution is therefore a voice of the Gospel." It is called the word of God put in the mouth of the minister, therefore it is not the voice or word of the minister present but the voice of God. Therefore,

4. It must be received as God's. "The power of the keys administers and exhibits the Gospel through absolution which is the true voice of the Gospel. When absolution is heard the Gospel is heard and the conscience is raised up and takes com-

---

\*Compend De Ministerio.

fort. And because God truly vivifies through the keys, they truly remit sins before God. Wherefore the voice of him pronouncing absolution must be trusted not otherwise than as a voice sounding from heaven" *Apology.*\* Being the Gospel, the Augsburg Confession says, "men are taught that they should highly regard absolution, because it is the voice of God and pronounced by the command of God." It was because the minister announced the Gospel by the authority of God, that Luther in the Smaller Catechism taught the ministers to ask those confessing, "Do you believe that my remission is the remission of God?" If anything more be necessary to set forth the idea of the Confessions in regard to this we have it in the A. C., Art. xxviii.: "Now their judgment is this; that the power of the keys, or the power of bishops, by the rule of the Gospel, is a power or commandment from God of preaching the Gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the sacraments. For Christ doth send His Apostles with this charge: 'As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosesover sins ye retain they are retained. Go and preach the Gospel to every creature,' &c. *This power is put in execution only by teaching or preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments,* either to many or to single individuals, in accordance with their call." The Smalcald Articles, under the subject of confession, discuss the external word and the sacraments. Also,

5. That this absolution is efficacious, or is really a forgiveness from God. They teach this *negatively* by denying that it is a forgiveness merely before the Church. The Apology specifies eleven errors concerning repentance taught by the Papists "contrary to all the writings of the Apostles, to all the Scriptures and to the Fathers," and the fifth of these errors is, "That the power of the keys grants remission of sin, not before God, but before the Church or the people." Again it says: "Some more prudent pretend that by the power of the keys sins are remitted before the Church, not before God. This also is a

---

\*Hase, v. 39, 40.

pernicious error."\* They teach it *positively*. The Larger Catechism says: "Now wherever there is a heart which feels its sins and desires consolation, it has here an indubitable resource in the word of God, that God through a human being releases and acquits it of sin." They teach that it comforts because it is a true forgiveness from God imparted to us in the word and sacraments administered by the Church through the ministry.

6. That private absolution is not essentially different from general absolution. The Augsburg Confession speaks of the power of the keys as being the same whether to many or to single individuals.

That this is a correct statement of the doctrine of the Lutheran Church cannot be proved better within the same compass than by Chemnitz, her greatest dogmatician, and who in his Examen was called to treat it more at large than any other of the Lutheran Fathers.

He says, concerning the nature of absolution,

1. That it announces the Gospel. "Absolution is nothing else than the voice of the Gospel announcing the remission of sins on account of Christ."<sup>†</sup> "Absolution is nothing else than the word of the Gospel announcing the remission of sins gratuitously on account of Christ to all who repent and believe the Gospel."<sup>‡</sup>

2. That private absolution applies the general promise to individuals. "The minister of private absolution applies the general promise of the Gospel to individuals seeking it."<sup>§</sup> "The voice of the Gospel, on account of a firmer and surer consolation, is applied to individuals through private absolution."

3. That it is efficacious. "There is no doubt that private absolution is efficacious, because it is the voice of the Gospel, which is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes."<sup>||</sup> "Private absolution announces the voice of the Gospel, through which there is no doubt that God works and remits sins to those who lay hold by faith on the Gospel in the absolution."<sup>¶</sup>

---

\*Hase, v. 4, 5.    †Frankford Ed. 1609, p. 393, b.    ¶395, a.    §p. 371, b.  
||p. 378, a.    ¶p. 375, b.

4. That God forgives sins through the agency of the minister of the word and sacraments. "God who alone forgives sins does not do this without means, but through the word and sacraments. Therefore in absolution God Himself through the ministry of the Gospel remits sins to individual believers, and in this manner the absolution of the minister is a testimony of divine remission, and thus the conscience has an evidence that its sins are truly forgiven by God."\* Therefore,

5. That absolution is not a prayer. "The sentiment of Gerson approves itself to me, that absolution, not in the manner of expressing a wish, imparted in the form of supplication, but in such a way that he who is absolved may hear and know that God, through the ministry announcing the Gospel, applies to himself the merit and benefits of Christ for the remission of sins."†

The precise difference between this doctrine of the Lutheran Church and that of the Roman is not easily stated, for it is not easy to determine precisely what the latter is. The common opinion, that Roman priests pretend to exercise an unconditional right or power to forgive sins absolutely, is doubtless a misrepresentation. Bishop Keane of Virginia said in a sermon, "No priest ever taught and no Catholic was ever such a consummate fool as to believe that a priest could forgive sins." Yet they have taught something so nearly like it that a great many Protestants have not been able to distinguish between them. The Council of Trent condemns the idea that the sacramental absolution of the priest is a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven. It teaches that "it is a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as by a judge," "that the power of forgiving and retaining sins was communicated to the Apostles and their lawful successors," that in the form of the sacrament of Penance "the principal force consists in the words of the minister, 'I absolve thee,' and that the prayers added to these words by no means regard the essence."‡ It teaches further, that no one but bishops and priests have the right to forgive sins, and these only within their own

\*375, b. †p. 378, a. ‡Session Fourteen, Canon ix, Chaps. I and III.  
VOL. XI. No. 3.

jurisdiction, and that they have this right by the virtue of the Holy Ghost which was bestowed on them in ordination.\* Dr. Hodge quotes Perrone as giving four points of the Romish doctrine: 1. Christ takes away sin by the ministry of the priests. 2. That priests sit as judges in the tribunal of Penance. 3. That their sentence is ratified in heaven. 4. That priests by this power are higher than the angels and even the very archangels. Bishop Challoner, in the Catholic Christian Instructed, after giving the form of absolution, gives this reason for regarding confession and absolution as a sacrament: "Because it is an outward sign of inward grace, ordained by Jesus Christ; the outward sign is found in the sinner's confession and the form of absolution pronounced by the priest; the inward grace is the remission of sins promised by Jesus Christ." If we put these facts together we have this general truth: that the Roman Church holds that the grace of Christ is imparted by a priesthood, who perform this function by virtue of the Holy Ghost, of whom they are the sole organs, and their judgments are confirmed in heaven. They claim to exercise immediately and directly the authority delegated to them. They dispense the grace of Christ as judges. Their power belongs to them as ordained persons. In this general conception of their doctrine we cannot be very much mistaken.

The Lutheran doctrine is altogether different. The whole power of absolution is in the divine word and sacraments. In no sense does the power belong to the person of the minister but entirely and solely to the means of grace. The right of giving absolution does not belong exclusively to the ministry but to every Christian according to the call. Absolution, being the Gospel, has as much efficacy when pronounced by a laymen as when by a bishop, for the Gospel is the power of God no matter by whose lips uttered. It is not the man who absolves, but the word. It is not the Holy Ghost through sacred officers, but the Holy Ghost in the word and sacraments, who remits sins. Absolution is an authorized announcement in God's name of what He has done, and not a pretended judicial sentence pronounced by one whose decision is by no means infallible.

---

\*Idem, Chapter VI.

The Lutheran Confessions teach a doctrine of absolution essentially different from Rome, and the form of absolution used by the early Lutherans must, therefore, be interpreted in harmony with that doctrine. The two forms are very much alike. The Romish priest says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee, and I, by His authority, absolve thee, in the first place, from every bond of excommunication or interdict, as I have power and thou standest in need; in the next place, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." Luther proposed this form: "I, according to the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, remit thy sins, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Amen." This similarity has given plausibility to the charge that Lutherans hold to priestly absolution. But the same reason that made them retain private confession in a form very much like auricular confession, made them retain a form of absolution similar. The great reason was that the people were accustomed to it. The Lutheran form may be understood in a sense to which no Protestant can find objection. When taken in that sense both by the confessor and the confessing, it may be properly used. That the people were faithfully and diligently taught concerning the nature of absolution, the Augsburg Confession and the Apology assert. It was taken not in a Romish but Lutheran sense. Our English edition of the Book of Concord has given the real spirit and intent of the words by rendering them, "I, by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, *announce* unto thee," &c.

The Lutheran Confessions, in common with other Protestants, teach that absolution, both public and private, is declarative. Calvin wrote: "When we treat of the keys we must always beware of dreaming of any power apart from the preaching of the Gospel. Whatever privilege of binding and loosing Christ has bestowed on His Church is annexed to the word. This is especially true with regard to the ministry of the keys, the whole power of which consists in this, that the grace of the Gospel is publicly and privately sealed on the minds of believers by means of those whom the Lord appointed, and the only method

in which this is done is by preaching."\* He was not so afraid of pronouncing absolution as was some of his friends. Bingham says, that "Calvin declares he was very desirous to have had such a general declaratory absolution inserted into the Geneva liturgy, but could not prevail with his associates to introduce it." Calvin was not opposed to private absolution. "Nor is private absolution of less benefit or efficacy when asked by those who stand in need of a special remedy for their infirmity. It not seldom happens that he who hears general promises which are intended for the whole congregation of the faithful, nevertheless remains somewhat in doubt and is still disquieted in mind as if his own remission were not obtained. Should this individual lay open the secret wound of his soul to his pastor and hear these words of the Gospel specially addressed to him, 'Son be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee,' his mind will feel secure, and escape from the trepidation with which it was previously agitated."† He grants both the propriety and power of private absolution. Did we not know the author we might think this was written by a Lutheran. The sentiment that the power of the keys "is annexed to the word," is Lutheran, and if he had added, "administering the sacraments," his language would have been very much like that of the Augsburg Confession when he says this power is exercised by preaching.

But the Lutheran Confessions teach that the absolution is more than simply declarative. The difference between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic doctrines on this is the same as that on the nature and efficacy of the word and the sacraments. The Confessions say that absolution is the Gospel and the Gospel is the power of God. The word brings God's power to accept, believe and obey. Forgiveness depends upon faith and repentance, but these are given through the Gospel. When we are told to believe we receive with the words the grace to enable us to believe. God's word is never without God's power. It is never an empty, ineffectual call. In preaching that word, whether to many or to the individual, we are administering God's gracious and saving power. God's word is spirit

\*Institutes, Book III, chap. iv., 14.

†Institutes, Book III., chap. iv., 14.

and life. It is quick and powerful. Christ came "to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and to set at liberty them that are bruised." He forgave sins. He did it by His word. His word was the power that broke the chains of the captive. He put that word into the hands of His people, and as the Father had sent Him so He sent them to preach deliverance to captives. The word, enveloping a divine power, is the means by which they are to execute that commission of deep import: "Whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." If private absolution is nothing more than the Gospel, and if the Gospel is the power of God, that absolution must be much more than a mere declaration. It has all the efficacy of God's word.

If the Lutheran view of the Sacraments is true they must be joined with the word as means of absolution. Nor is this peculiar to Lutherans. Bingham\* gives as one of the four kinds of absolution, sacramental absolution. "Baptism," he says, "is the grand absolution of the Christian Church." Of the Holy Supper he says: "That also is a means of conveying and sealing to men the remission of sins, and differs from Baptism only in this, that Baptism is the first grant of such a blessing, and the Lord's Supper is a further confirmation or continuance and repetition of it." "And herein consists, he continues, "the first act of the minister's power in remitting or retaining sins, by applying to men the sacraments of the Church in the use of which remission of sins is granted to all worthy receivers." Bingham is only one of a large number among the members of the Church of England from the beginning, who have held the same views in this matter. The Lutheran Church is therefore not alone among Protestants in holding that absolution is connected with the Sacraments.

Baptism, according to the Lutheran view, is a means of regeneration. It is a means of uniting us to Christ and making us members of His body. If this be true, then in administering it remission of sins is administered. In the Holy Supper, according to the Lutheran doctrine, there is the blood of Christ

---

\*Christian Antiquities, Appendix to Book xix.

that cleanses from sin, and in administering it remission of sins is imparted. Whether publicly or privately the sacraments are applications of the Gospel to individuals, and in this respect are the same with private absolution. This was the reason that Luther in the Smalcald Articles treats of the sacraments under the head of Confession.

The Lutheran minister, in giving private absolution, was never in fear of coming into conflict with the judgments of God. He did not forgive one whom God had not forgiven. The absolution was conditioned on the true faith and penitence of those confessing, of which he did not pretend to judge, further than every minister is required to do in giving the comfort of the Gospel and in administering the sacraments. The minister is only the ambassador through whose ministrations God carries on His work. He bears the offer of pardon, and in the means conveys it, but whether it be personally appropriated or not he does not claim to infallibly determine. It is the same in preaching. He announces pardon and his words convey it to his hearers, but with that his work ends. He can never go further than to say, if you are truly penitent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ your sins are forgiven, and being commissioned by Him to announce it, I pronounce the forgiveness of your sins. But if you are hypocritical your sins are not forgiven. There is here no possibility of conflict between his word and God's.

Private confession in the form practiced in the early Lutheran Church has very generally been abandoned. Is it desirable to renew it? There are some reasons for answering affirmatively. Dr. Martensen\* says: "Nevertheless the deep need of human nature, that we speak of, certainly finds more satisfaction in the Evangelical Church, where there subsists a closer connection between the pastor and the several members of the fellowship; and it is a matter of deep regret that private confession, as an institution, meeting this want in a regular manner, has fallen into disuse; and that the objective point of union is wanting for many who desire to unburden their souls by confessing not to God only but to a fellow-man, and who feel their need

---

\*Christian Dogmatics.

of comfort and of forgiveness, which any one indeed may draw for himself from the Gospel, but which in many instances he may desire to hear spoken by a man who speaks in virtue of his holy office." But he knew the difficulties for he says: "The revival of private confession at present seems practicable only where the Lutheran Church exists in small and separate fellowships far apart from each other."<sup>\*</sup>

But there are more reasons for answering negatively. There are opportunities of abuse that cannot be safely trusted to the hands of men in our age. That it was abused in any part of the Protestant Church we do not know, but it is possible to abuse it. The confession may be humiliating, but the restricted form of private confession practiced by the Reformers contains a power we should be sorry to see placed in the hands of any body of men.

The re-introduction at this time would fall into a current that would carry it to excess. It would not guard against but strengthen the movement to plant on Protestant soil the Confessional—a movement growing out of a repudiation of our justification by faith, and with which no Protestant can have any sympathy.

The ends sought by private confession are secured without its dangers. The sacraments are administered in private to those asking. There is no faithful pastor who does not avail himself of every opportunity of preaching privately to individuals. The young are instructed. The distressed are comforted. Between the true pastor and his people there are such terms of affectionate confidence that all who desire can open to him the heart and receive such consolation and direction as the case requires. The devoted and observant minister does not need a regular system of private confession to learn the condition and wants of his charge. The hirelings in the ministry would use private confession in such a perfunctory way as to destroy all its benefits.

This applies only to our English congregations. Among the Swedes and Germans of the Synodical Conference it is still

---

\*Dogmatics, Sect. 271.

practiced, but is growing into disuse. Among them it is entirely at the choice of the people. Any person desiring to make private confession applies to his pastor. Swedish ministers say that only the more devout make application. The number of calls to hear such confessions is one of their marks of the success of their preaching. If they are not mistaken the neglect is a sad evidence of decreasing spirituality. All who are interested in true spiritual life will unite in the prayer that among them it may be retained.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### HUMAN INSTRUMENTALITY IN GOD'S WORK.\*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

"Give ye them to eat."—Matthew 14: 16.

It was to the twelve, with but a few loaves and fishes, in the presence of five thousand hungry men, that our Lord gave this strange command. He meant Himself to feed them; but He arranges the order of things so as to bring even the mighty miracle under the law into which all the world has been framed—that what the divine love means for man's good shall be given through human instrumentality. His own supernatural gifts are made to wait on the agency of His disciples. Men are to do the work of God—else it is not done. Even a miracle will not set aside this law. Nay, the miracle is so ordered as to throw the law into more impressive distinctness, and make it ray out like a well-set diamond.

We wish your attention to this great subject of human instrumentality in the work of God, as a proper subject to engage your minds in this last hour of counsel from the institution that enrolls you as her sons. It may throw some light for the days and years to come.

I. The fact of human instrumentality in God's work is unquestionable. It is one of those large truths that may be read

---

\*A Baccalaureate Discourse, delivered June 26th, 1881.

on all the pages of history and revelation. Though some persons read it nowhere, it is legible everywhere. It is the continuation and crown of that divine method of *means for ends* which begins away down in the lowest and most primary movements of nature. God, indeed, is the first great Cause of all things. He is the Fountain. From atoms to worlds all things are His. He does and gives whatever is done and given. But everywhere His will is wrought out by *means*. How He may have done in the very beginning, we know not; but as we see Him working now or can trace His method in past ages, He does nothing directly. Science teaches that He has shaped the world, from its deepest rocks to the smallest cloud that sails in its sky, by use of second causes. These carry forward His ceaselessly creative will. Whether He forms a world, or lifts an island from the sea, whether He stores up metals and fuel in the earth's strata, or scatters tiny seeds to clothe the hills in green, it is done by commissioning some competent agencies. He says to these working powers: "Build the cosmos and flood it with glory." He says to the sun-rays: "Paint the rose, cover the fields with beauty, fill earth's nights with moonlight." It is thus that He speaks and it is done. To the open ear all the universe is vocal with the tread and movement of the myriad myriad energetic powers that hear His voice and do what He wishes to have done.

This law is carried up and consummated in *human* instrumentality. It holds in the high sphere of man's freedom as well as in the lower sphere of simple nature. Man, as truly as are the forces of matter, is designed to be an *instrument*, working out the purposes of the divine love. The first great appointment the race ever received, its primary and most fundamental consecration, was to "dress and keep" the Edenic earth—man being made a fellow-worker with God for the beauty and order of the realm in and over which he was set. That was the germ of all the earth's industries and prosperities. It was the announcement, at the very start, and the primary inauguration, of the principle that the world's development and progress was to be thrown upon men's own hands. A commissioned

dominion was given over God's work. Even when the crown fell from man's brow, the work was not taken out of his hands. The very miracle of redemption, for recovery out of sin, was made to sweep down into luminous recognition of this principle. When by man came sin, by man came also redemption from sin—the very atonement by the Son of God being made by the divine author of it acting in our own nature. The human factor is never to drop or be superseded.

Indeed, so large and clear has been the play of second causes in nature, and of human agency in history, in the progress of knowledge, science, religion and improvement, that some persons see nothing else. They say there is only this and nothing more. They discern nothing in the universe but nature and man—nothing above or behind this. But this is the blindness of atheism. All things are "of God." "Every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of light." He *has* His work to do in the world. But for this very reason men are appointed workers. If His work is to go on, while He wills blessed things they must work out that will, even to their own "salvation." If the world's needs are to be met and its disorders harmonized, if its woes are to be wiped away and its voices of misery turned into songs, if bread is to be supplied to the bodily and spiritual necessities of the perishing, if the world is to be lifted up to still purer conditions and life into higher, more blessed character, it all depends on this ministry of man to man. Whatever precious things Heaven means for each man's personal life; whatever is to exalt the family, society, the Church, the state, and business; whatever advances are to be made in science, discovery or invention, subjugating nature to human welfare and enjoyment; whatever high and precious things are in God's loving counsel for the temporal and spiritual exaltation and joy of the race, are to come through human agency. Even the "new heaven and new earth" are to be created in this way.

Sublime indeed is the position of man. God has taken him very near the throne—to work with Him. Upon the use man makes of his freedom—for he is free—depend the curves and lines of history, the hastening or retarding of the earth's ad-

vance to its meaning and goal. The loftiest import of his nature and appointment is as a worker of God's work, an instrument for distributing the divine gifts and turning Heaven's wise and loving purposes into effect in human welfare. The grandest power that God has put on earth is that thus given to the hands of man—lodged in his influence on his fellow-men, especially for moral character and happiness. We see many mighty powers in play in the physical world—in gravitation which holds the mountains to their foundations and rolls the rivers to the sea, in steam that moves the heavy trains across the continents, or in electricity flashing in glory from horizon to horizon. But man's is a grander power. For it plays not simply in and through material movements, though, through reason and science, it does get hold of all these with lordly control. But it operates especially in the higher sphere of truth, thought, feeling and spiritual life, in which the tremendous interests of character and happiness in this world and forever are involved.

This instrumental relation for God's work is the high thing to which every one of you is called. There is other work than God's going on in the world. Every young man soon finds this out—especially if he is not engaged in it. "An enemy hath done this." This aggravates the necessities to be met, and makes the summons for this holy service real and loud to each of you. God has made every one of you for Himself. He has put something in your hands for the good of the human life about you, something that may feed, strengthen, cheer, quicken and help others, and do the work of the divine love; and He sends you forth with the word: "*Give—do what you can.*"

II. This instrumental service, thus meant to be and shape your life-work, is marked by some very deep features. To fulfill it well calls for such things as these:

1. It requires *piety*. God's work is to be done by God's people. There is not a spot on earth where you can safely put a bad man for its happiness and improvement. It is true, that the deeds of the wicked are sometimes turned to service. A Cyrus may be used to send back the chosen people and build Jerusalem. The foul act of a Judas may help to bring in the new

age of grace. A Pilate's terrific deed may go into the creed of the Church. The very crimes that work wide overthrow to men and nations, may lift beacon lights for human safety. A racy writer has lately maintained that even fools are a blessing to society, as "the cyphers of the community without which the social problem could not be worked out." Placed right, cyphers may indeed count, but solid integers count more and better, especially solid human integers. But what may come through wickedness and folly is not the service Heaven is asking men to render. As a rule, wrong-doers blight, blacken and kill. The ungodly cannot do the holy work of God in the world. The servants of sin are the destroyers of good. If you are to give light to others, you must be the children of light. If you are to purify, you must be pure. If you are to lift up, you dare not be in the degradation of vice. God has *redeemed* men to make them right instruments, to fit them for the divine work on earth. Unsaved themselves, they are not fit. It is to *disciples* that the summons comes: "Give ye to men the bread of God to eat."

The truth cannot be too deeply fixed in the minds of young men, that the very foundations of the life of true usefulness are reached in Christian character. You must be joined with Christ and carry out His will. That one word, Christ, indeed, gives the heart and the sum of the true life. "For me to live is Christ," is the confession of the man who has got his right attitude for life's work. Only by working in and with Him do you come to work with the purpose and to the goal of all history, and the earth's plan. What you *are*, decides whether you will be worth anything to the world. The qualities and adaptations of every instrument determine its work. When a man is good his very life and movement become a helpful power. Light streams from him as naturally as from stars. His influence is shed forth, even unconsciously, as fragrance from flowers. When your character is Christian and pure, beautiful in integrity, rich in the graces of a sanctified spirit, manly and strong in the forces of true holiness, then you may take your right place and do your right work in the world, and not till then.

Even Daniel Webster has said: "Religion is the tie that connects man with his Creator and holds him to His throne. If that tie is sundered or broken, he floats away a *worthless atom* in the universe—its proper attractions all gone, its destiny thwarted, and its whole future nothing but darkness, desolation and death."

2. It requires, further, strong *confidence in truth and righteousness*. There can be no well-sustained inspiration in the human soul for beneficent life, where faith in these has been lost, or is feeble. Doubt as to the possibility of finding the truth amid the world's darkness and confusions—a doubt which the fliprant part of our day's thinking is trying to call wisdom and identify with learning—all breaking of trust in the sufficiency, safety and success of the principles of righteousness, becomes weakness to character, and cuts the nerves of useful activity. It is but the silliest ignorance of the law of cause and effect, when men tell us that the truth of our views, doctrines, or convictions is a small matter, and intimate that an almost equally serviceable working force may come of error, skepticism and unbelief as of real truth and sound principles. No mere rosy fancies about the destined advance of man, no soft sentimentality about charity being the only blessed power, can ever do God's hard and earnest work in the world. No man for whom the foundations of rectitude or duty are either destroyed or made uncertain, will have either stamina enough to stand or force to advance. Doubt is the bane of steadfastness, of courage, of enterprise. It produces no reformers, no martyrs to principle, no lives of self sacrifice. The weakness that bends and trims before opposition, resorts to compromises and obliquities in temptation, becomes tremulously afraid when storms gather and the clouds shut off the light, is often largely from lack of faith in truth and principle, or in the safety, strength and victory of righteousness. You can see this weakness every day, unmanning men, surrendering to evil the opportunities for good, giving up God's banners to the hands of enemies. Nothing less than a strong and inspiring confidence in the supremacy and adequacy of truth and righteousness, can give the required nerve and muscle, and deliver God's ringing strokes upon the

evil that needs to be removed, or accomplish the good that is to be made triumphant in the world.

Nor can this confidence in righteousness be maintained, if separated from the great truths that have created it. Often are we told, these days, that the world has outgrown nearly all our fathers held as truth. We are to abandon belief in God and immortality, in responsibility and Providence, as misconceptions. Supernatural revelation and miracle are to be looked on as myths. Even conscience is but an accumulation of impressions from man's environment for ages, having no meaning, force or authority except as the result and history of his past experiences. But we are told that no harm can come from this, as morality, and righteousness, do not depend on these old beliefs, that Christian ethics may be retained, while we throw Christianity away. We are boldly told to 'believe in righteousness,' though we have lost faith in every thing else. But if we could treat the universal convictions of God and conscience as phantoms, and the mighty powers of the Gospel which have revolutionized the world and put levers of otherwise impossible elevation under our race, as dreams, what authority would any of the fine sentiments they have left be to us? These sentiments and feelings could not long survive the drying up of their source. Confidence in righteousness would soon die, if belief in a righteous God were banished from the human soul. Christian sentiments and virtues would vanish if Christianity were buried. They would wither like the fruit of a tree cleft off from its roots. They would go out in darkness, as the lambent flame, when a blast of wind separates it from the body of fire.

3. A further feature. It calls for *all your resources*. Each man is not only to do something, but all he can. It has sometimes been thought that, in the incident before us, our Lord required an impossibility of the disciples. Some have supposed He meant to teach that duty goes beyond ability, and our powers are not the measure of our obligations. But the disciples were actually able to do, and did do, what they were commanded. Though the supply was not all in hand, it came to obedient endeavor. In themselves they were unable, but able in Christ. And this is always the principle governing this point. It may

be but a withered hand that this human instrumentality is to lift, but obedience can lift it whenever God calls.

That what each one has to do is a draft upon all his resources is, perhaps, best explained by the fact that his powers are divinely organized into the sphere in which he is set. The fullest inventory of all he can command, will not exhibit more than that sphere will call for. Though he be put only in humble places and ordinary spheres, he has in himself nothing to waste. Rather, like the disciples, with the loaves, he may feel his utmost too little. It is a terrible mistake when men, especially young men, estimate themselves as having a surplusage of abilities that needs not be trained or brought into action. This leaves them smaller than they might be, when their best would be small. It leaves work undone. It makes dwarfs and weaklings where strong efficiency is needed. Every man is wanted at his best. If any of you falls below this, somebody must suffer, some circle of life be left poorer than it ought, some good causes left weaker, some cankers of evil permitted to work in their wasting action.

It is one of the strangest forms of silly fatuity, often seen in young men as they enter the golden gates of active life, that they do practically assume they can fulfill their work and reach their proper goal, in the development and use of only a part of their resources. This explains the weakness, blundering, nervelessness, pitiable inefficiency and failure of thousands. At the best they would have only a few loaves and fishes for the world's need, but they make it only half a loaf, if any thing at all that is good for man.

4. It requires also *plan, order, method, forethought*. The beneficent instrumentality meant in man's mission on earth, cannot be fulfilled by blind, random, unsystematized endeavor. The young must be forever reminded that want of system means want of true and best success. Order is Heaven's first law. Forecasting arrangement is seen everywhere. It is truly a grand and impressive fact, observable all through the realms of nature and history, that the forces and activities through which the aims of the divine goodness are happily accomplished, are all well adjusted, systematic and regular. From the might-

iest agencies that frame together the foundations of the hills, down to the gentle forces that construct a peach or ripen a cherry, you find none casual, arbitrary, capricious. All are self-consistent and orderly, bearing evidences of thoughtful design. Anarchic powers seem to be allowed only for judgment. They may desolate and destroy—may shake down mountains and bury cities, may blight the wealth of fertile fields or scatter the works of labored art. But for every beneficent agency, thoughtful order is the essential feature. In nature, God has guarded against the defeat of His plans by tying up all material forces in fixed movement and orderly system. Thus they work results of beauty and joy—not monstrosities. In human instrumentality, man's freedom is asked to adopt the orderliness of method reflected in nature. It may be but a hint, but it is a flashing hint, of this needful principle, when our Lord, in the incident of the text directs : "*Make the men sit down in companies, of about fifty.*" Forethought, plan, order, propriety, suitableness, not random and confusion, was to mark all their instrumental activity. God's glory could shine out from the miracle, only if the beauty of the divine thoughtfulness and order overspread and illuminated all the work. Sensationalists sometimes, these days, tell us that Christ's originality swept away all narrow, restricted grooves of doing God's work, and inaugurated the principle of following every man only his own suggestions. He *did sweep* some things away—but only the false grooves and spurious restrictions by which Pharisaic and other human arbitrariness had shut men off from the real divine order. Never was there a life in which the relations of means and ends, thoughtful suitability and propriety, were so beautifully presented as in the life of Jesus Christ.

Human unwisdom, inconsiderateness, arbitrariness, self-will, hinder and mar many of God's loving counsels. They blight all work. They throw confusion into every movement by which life and the world are to be made better. There are some well-meaning souls who go through life like notes of discord through a song, spoiling it all. They go on, as if the good they do was to be measured by the proprieties they set at nought, the fitnesses they disregard, the established rules they scorn, the amenities

they overlook, the reckless arbitrarinesses they can show. They seem to think that even supernatural grace must be honored by making it work through all conceivable and inconceivable unsuitabilities and confusions. They would probably think they were doing something only if they could scatter the broken bread through the air over among the struggling crowds—not much if constrained to shape their agency into the regularity of an apparent meal.

The desire of men to work in their own individuality and originality, is indeed a manly and worthy thing, and, operating within proper limits, becomes creative of fresh energy, and productive of the best progress. But the temptation to its excess, in disregard of suitableness, or reckless of true order, is a snare to many men. You see its fruits in the grotesque sensationalism that reigns in every sphere of present American activity. To be peculiar, odd, is the easiest way to a cheap notoriety, and shallow souls mistake the ephemeral stir for success. Even real genius often thus blights its usefulness. If it becomes erratic, startling men and society by its freaks and extravagances, thoughtlessly disregarding the laws of orderly life, it may arrest great attention, and be stared at as men stare at flashing pyrotechnics, but its serviceableness is broken by its wild non-adaptations. Even slow and plodding men are of more use. Every department of practical life and service finds its best strength in the ordinary talent of careful, wise, methodic men. Our best statesmen, lawyers, judges, merchants, mechanics are not erratic geniuses, nor helter-skelter indifferentists. God's work can stand only a few of these. The world is meant to be full of the beauty of true order; and your agency and mine in it requires observance of the great law of fitness and order. The humblest of us, by plan, and method and systematized working, may become instruments of great and blessed serviceableness in the world.

5. A feature closely allied, if not involved in this, is that it is *associative*. There is a divine solidarity in human life. The race is a vast organism. Callings, professions, trades, arts, business of all kinds meet, touch, interlock, and support one

another. The humblest avocation has its place as truly as the most prominent. Each is dependent on the rest. No man's work can stand alone or be done alone. Each must give and receive help, filling its own place and transmitting something for the aggregate common movement and result. As the disciples were employed to work *together* in that loving service in the desert, so you, and all servants of God and humanity, in all ages, are designed to work *with* all others, shaping your work into cheerful, sympathetic harmony with your co-laborers. This law of concurrence is reflected, as from a mirror, even from nature. The agencies in material force are not only orderly, as in beautiful specific suitableness, but they move in squadrons, they keep step with one another, they reach out and join hands, sweeping onward the whole broad movement in unison; and together they make a beautiful earth and all the beautiful and blessed scenes on earth. An atom can do but little alone; but, helping each other, what a universe of glory they build.

The instrumentality which man's free action is to accomplish must just as truly be associate. One and another, scores and hundreds, thousands and millions must think, feel and act in concert, if God's work of good is to be done. It is an absurd mistake to think, as many seem to, that the divine work on earth is done, or to be done, only by ministers, missionaries, Sunday school teachers, or simply in the so-called sacred services, the specific spheres and acts of religion and charity. The work is much broader and grander. The workmen and their spheres are infinitely more varied. To make the world what it is meant to be, and ought to be, for man, to lift him to his proper elevation and happiness here, and set him forward with right character into the great hereafter, calls for every kind of service that Christ-like human hearts and hands can render, in every proper calling. It embraces, indeed, the minister in the pulpit, the missionary on pagan shores, and all the distinctively religious activities known to the vocabulary of the Church's efforts. But just as truly, though less directly, does it include all the labor in every range of secular enterprise and industry, in education, science, art, invention, mechanics, trade, and common toil. The physician prescribing by the couch of

pain, the judge who administers law and rights the wrongs of the injured, the writer who brings golden truth from the treasures of the past or flashes the light of quickening thought for his times, the farmer who is creating bread from the fields, the scientist who reverently questions nature for the thoughts and plans of God, the inventor who is substituting effective machinery for the labor of muscle, the merchant that delivers the products of the varied earth across the seas or distributes them for the comfort and joy of every home, the mechanic who builds ships and factories and homes and furniture, the laborer who levels roads or digs wells—and the Saviour, you remember, standing by one saying : "Give me to drink," counted even a well as helping Him in His work—the domestics that cook our food or cleanse our clothes—all and each have a necessary part in Heaven's plan for human welfare and the world's progress. God gives to no class a monopoly of His work, as He gives to none a monopoly of piety. In Church and State, in society, in the family, the consecrated help of ten thousand processes is required, wheels within wheels in every movement ; and you may find your instrumental relation in any of the forms of labor, innumerable as are the proper activities of life.

"They also serve who only wait"

and teach men how to *bear* the evils that will not away. God's army of advance moves all along the line. You are to take your place and fill your space. Wherever you have your part, it joins with all the rest. You are to keep the brotherhood of God's work. If you are at the summit, look down on no form of upright toil. If you are at the bottom, feel that you can be as near to God in yours as is possible in any.

6. One more feature must be added, to crown all—*perseverance*. On this point it is enough to remind you that nothing great or worthy can be accomplished except by constancy and persistence. Grand results are not achieved so much by strength as by perseverance. The Strasburg cathedral was raised by single stones, but what a thing of grandeur and beauty it has been made. He that shall walk with vigor three hours a day will, in seven years, pass a space equal to the circumference of the

globe. Perseverance can give even a slow or feeble instrumentality a glorious efficiency.

III. But we must remind you of the great design of this service into which all good men are called. It is twofold:

1. Unquestionably, its direct and immediate intent is to supply the wants of the needy and carry the world up to its true welfare and happiness. The earth is full of burdens to be lightened and woes to be wiped away. The weight of ignorance, sin and suffering lies heavily everywhere. There is not a land under the sun, not a community, not a house, not a heart, where relief is not wanted and help needed. The world into which the young man goes, as he leaves college behind him, finds a not unfitting type in that wilderness desert where the condition of the multitudes drew Christ's compassion—multitudes scattered, weak, suffering, diseased, in danger, seeking something, perhaps they knew not what, for body, mind, for enjoyment or life. The voices of unrest and want are heard everywhere, filling the very air with the confusion of their sad pleadings. Look over the land and through society—see the hundred evils that need to be corrected, some of them clinging like hard barnacles to all forms of life, some sucking the blood of men like vampires, the lusts of appetite and money keeping open a million fountains of woe and death in the liquor traffic, fraud disordering every kind of business, vice and crime lurking in every street and alley and waylaying innocence and virtue in open day and curtained night, slander's assassinating tongue everywhere loose at its thin end, selfishness and pride still fighting against the peace and order of every community and every house. A day that still gives free reins to the liquor business, and can grow such a foul canker as the speculative insurance monstrosity and crime, has plenty of work for God's instruments to do. Where two such things can flourish, the soil of evil must still be strong and prolific.

The possibilities of happy human life are not yet all worked out. The progress already achieved, may be taken as foreshadowing much more to come. Manifold as are remaining evils, the earth is leaving much of its inferior past behind. Under the guiding light of Christianity, the last fifty years have

brought grand things out of nature's possibilities—useless for all earlier generations—steamships, railroads, telegraphs, myriad forms of cunning machinery, making a new earth for man's industrial life. Reform after reform has been shivering bondages and oppressions and lifting men into freedom and higher life. Still grander things are possible. God's plan is to make Christian truth, Christian science and Christian enterprise still work away evil and bring in good—to make real for the race the utmost progress that the possibilities of nature and grace will allow. Here is the large divine intent for your service. Every young man is called to his part. The love of God sends him forth to make life better and happier wherever he moves, to purify it by his own manly character, to lead it by the force of worthy example, and to help it with holy work.

Let no one of you think his instrumentality too feeble to be of service. God divides all mankind into companies of fifties, or less, making circles small enough for your influence. It is the little things that, working together, do all the beneficent work of God in nature and history. It is mainly the quiet, unpretentious forces that make the earth a scene of beauty and human life at once strong in power and rich in joy. It is not grand battles alone that help humanity, nor great poems alone that make the generations grow. There is a still small rain of personal influence, that does even more for the refreshment and beauty of life. The smallest work fills its place, and the least wave of blessed influence mingles its seemingly broken force with all the ocean of time. It has been said that the word you utter never dies out of the world's vibrating air. It has been said that the stamp of the child's foot shakes, however feebly, all the particles of the globe. However this may be, your work, if true and faithful, will surely relieve some need and make some life about you better and stronger. You will reflect some of God's light, and that can never die. Longfellow has said:

"I shot an arrow into the air,  
It fell to earth, I knew not where ;  
For so swift it flew, the sight  
Could not follow it in its flight.  
I breathed a song into the air,  
It fell to earth, I knew not where ;

For who hath sight so keen and strong  
That it can follow the flight of song?  
Long, long afterward, in an oak,  
I found the arrow still unbroke;  
And the song, from beginning to end,  
I found again in the heart of a friend."

It is a mirror of the permanence and lasting power of your seemingly transient and untraceable acts. But a simple strain of good thought breathed into the heart of a child may sing there through life, and prolong its echoes forever.

Never are kind acts done  
To wipe the weeping eyes,  
But like flashes of the sun  
They signal to the skies,  
And up above the angels read  
How we have helped the soror need."—*Burton.*

2. But there is another part of the design—*the good of the worker.* God does His work by you for your sake. He means gain to yourself not less than to others. The most blighting damage Heaven could do to man, would be to throw him out of this office. All the best opportunity of his nature and manhood would be gone.

There is a significant phenomenon often visible in homes of wealth and comfort. The parents have, perhaps, surrendered themselves to a life of labor and care for their children. The children have been waited on and every want and whim supplied, but they have not been required to forego or give up anything, or themselves become part of the working, helping force of the house. And they grow up ease-seeking and self-willed, unappreciative as to what they enjoy, and void of the generous and cheerful temper to serve others that is essential to every noble and manly life. It shows the need human nature has to be put to work for others, to be trained out of selfishness into something higher, larger, sweeter, lovelier. God gets all the highest, purest, ripest fruits of character, through the exercise He gives His children in doing His work. He thus develops their love and goodness, makes them capable, large, strong and royal. This working cleans out the soil of the worker's nature, weeds out or keeps from growing the choking,

ugly growths of selfishness. No one can be much of a man, unless raised above this.

"All thoughts of ill; all evil deeds  
That have their root in thoughts of ill;  
Whatever hinders or impedes  
The action of the nobler will;  
All these must be first trampled down  
Beneath our feet, if we would gain  
In the bright fields of fair renown  
The right of eminent domain."

It would have been a serious loss to the twelve, not to have been employed in feeding those five thousand. They were far better and happier for it. Not only did it give them a thrill of pleasure as they were accomplishing it, and perpetual thrills of pleasure afterward in remembering it, but it stirred their kindlier impulses and gave uplift to their nature. Their purer sympathies and manlier impulses were brought into happy action. Their hearts were sweetened and their lives quickened by what they did. They were tasting and strengthening on better food than they passed to the multitudes. And the twelve baskets full of fragments, the tokens of the successful achievement, might sparkle to their eyes with the light of diamonds.

This is the true way of increase to one's possessions. He may have, as they had, but little to begin with, only a few loaves and fishes to use for the multitude. He may seem too poor in strength and resources to do anything—at least not equal to the need. But it is always accepted according that which a man hath. And it will soon be found that he can give more than he possesses. The treasures of a true life grow with the trading in them. They become abundant by loving expenditure. True work is fructifying. God's workers have more when they have given than before. The fragments gathered are more than the loaves unbroken. And the fullest men that the ages are permitted to see or glory in, the richest in all the elements that true men are made of, are the men who apparently expend all their powers in God's work. The little with which they began is returned to their possession in constant enlargement, until at last they are rich even "toward God"—measuring out toward Him in moral character and joy.

"Beautiful lives are those that bless,  
Silent rivers of happiness."

Young gentlemen of the class of '81, I have preached to you, this morning, the gospel of work. It is as true a gospel as that of faith. For, the evangel of faith is in vain, unless it fruits into this. Over against the new gospel of doubt, whose self-appointed apostles preach so noisily, and as perfecting the life of trust, we declare God's great summons to labor. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." I know of no better way to express the desire and hope of the institution that graduates you, than to say that she sends you forth especially to do God's work in the Church and the world, and to find your work in doing His. As a Christian institution, she believes that every Christian life she sends out, equipped with the power of sanctified education and culture, carries help to the plan of God and every holy interest of man. She believes there is room for you and work for you. She commends you to your place, whatever it be. Go to it humbly, but bravely.

You need not be told how sincerely the institution cherishes a desire for the welfare and success of each of you. And if you will only accept the position and service to which Heaven thus calls you, everything will be secured. For instance, it will secure your continued growth in knowledge. The years you have devoted to study in College, are a pledge of your desire of knowledge. With all that you have gained, you feel there is room for more. You are in the vestibule yet. Perhaps you think your education has to stop. By no means; but the method of it is in part changed. You go forth into God's great university of work. There you are further to learn the truth of things. Living libraries of nature and life will be ranged all about you. No man ever has learned any truth, doctrine, or lesson fully, till he has practiced it. You cannot understand it thoroughly till you have turned it into life. The actual work of life, if you are working with God, will reveal many a new truth to your souls, and revise many you imagined you knew well. Without this, you may know something *about* things, but the very things themselves are understood by experience. When you come to work with the Master in the great service

of life, it will brush away many of the rose-colored fancies of your study, and thrill you through with profounder conceptions of the world's great plan and movement. You will find moral principles go down deeper into the issues of life than you now see. You will find that they ascend higher and carry more solemn destinies. You are never done learning, till eternity can have no more service for you to do with and for the great Source of wisdom.

"The universe, all glittering through with stars,  
Is kept by God an everlasting school."

In this you will penetrate to the depths and climb to the heights of the best knowledge.

It will also insure your *safety*. The world into which you pass is an ordeal of character. You will need to assert the purity of a true life amid surrounding corruptions and incessant temptations. You will find yourselves sometimes amid treacherous, sometimes amid dashing, currents of evil. The strongest safety we know of, under God, is that harmony of life with righteousness implied in truly doing God's work. This itself antagonizes a man to every vice and evil. Employed in this work, he is not used in Satan's. The 'sword of Bunker Hill' is surely safe from British use while cleaving its way in freedom's service. It is true, some men have fallen while professedly in the midst of this divine service—from high places in the Church. But we must always distinguish between true service and spurious, between a whole-souled and a half-hearted or divided service. Judas fell because he was only apparently *of* the work. The man who with whole soul and full consecration is working the work of God is safe. It is more to him than coat of mail. You may go down safely into the world, mingle in secure purity among publicans and sinners, through all the ordeals of business and life, if you go as the Saviour Himself went—to finish 'the work which the Father gives you to do.'

And this will combine the largest usefulness with your truest happiness. It is a noble aspiration in a young man, to desire to be useful. And you wish to be happy. The two things are united. You have both together. He whose life is at-

tuned to God's service in working blessing for men, finds the sweetest, purest satisfactions that Heaven has provided for man. 'Tis true, a lazy soul can never know the joy that springs from labor. Nor can the useless life that declines the gospel of work ever produce a character of high excellenc. God never built a great or happy man in a non-working life.

The young men that go forth from the Colleges of the land are found in after years divided into three classes. One class is formed of the irreligious, who wholly refuse to take account of the divine purpose or plan in their lives, or to yield themselves or their members as instruments of righteousness unto God. Some of these, sometimes from cankers of sin seen as spots while in College, fall wrecked and ruined by the way. Some continue workers of evil, living to their own selfishness. Another class are Christian, in the common sense, but predominantly controlled by selfish and ambitious aims. They have gone forth with little or no thought of doing God's work in the world. Their profession, or calling is chosen with no reference to it, without a consecration to it. Their lives bring little strength or encouragement to good causes. They touch their fellowmen, their community with no strong purifying, quickening, lifting influences. Their lives though, not positively bad, are disappointing. They do nothing worthy of their training. The world is not very glad for them. Whatever gardens God sets them to keep and dress are only half kept and half fruitful. The third class are the whole-hearted, earnest, two-handed men of work. Their vigorous grasp is felt wherever they touch. They are found in the advance lines—always with face to the front. Their sublime industry, their hand labor, is not the destruction of happiness, but the source of it. The sense of *doing* something, as well as of *being* something, is a pure and profound joy. We wish your place and rank to be with this noble, unselfish, blessed class, to whom at the end and all through belongs the benediction: "Well done, good and faithful."

Young gentlemen, the end has come to your relation as students. You pass from the scenes where for years you have worked *toward* the work which you face now. Your names

drop from the roll-call of College, but they appear in the great daily summons of God's providence to service and usefulness in the Church and the world. Day by day will a response be sought of you, all along the years of your life. You may scatter wide apart before those years are done. Be true Christian, earnest men, from first to last. There will be a roll-call again at the end. May your names then come bright and clear from the books which useful lives shall have written before God.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*The New Testament*, translated out of the Greek, being the version set forth 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised 1881, printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; *Christian Institutions*, essays on ecclesiastical subjects, by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D. D.; *Matthew and Mark*, with Notes, critical, explanatory and practical, designed for both pastors and people, by Rev. H. Cowles; *Faith and Freedom*, by Stopford A. Brook; *Suggestive Commentary on St. Luke*, with Critical and Homiletical Notes, by Dr. W. H. Van Doren, edited by James Kernahan, new edition; *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, Twelve Lectures on Biblical Criticism, with Notes, by W. Robertson Smith, M. A., recently Professor of Hebrew and Exegesis of the Old Testament, Free Church College, Aberdeen; *Circumstantial Evidences of Christianity*, by Daniel Carey; *Christ and Modern Thought*, with a Preliminary Lecture on the methods of meeting modern unbelief, by Joseph Cook (Boston Monday Lectures, 1880-81); *Christianity's Challenge*, and other phases of Christianity submitted for candid consideration, by Rev. Herrick Johnson; *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*, McClintock and Strong, vol. 9; *From Exile to Overthrow*, history of the Jews from the Babylonian Captivity to the destruction of the second Temple, by Rev. J. W. Mears; *Companion to the Revised Version* of the N. Test., explaining the reasons for the changes made on the authorized version, by Alex. Roberts, D. D., with supplement by a member of the American committee of Revision, authorized edition; *Unbelief in the 18th Century* as contrasted with its earlier and later history, the Cunningham lectures for 1880, by J. Cairns, D. D.; *The Theistic Argument* as affected by recent Theories, a Course of Lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute in Boston, by J. Lewis Diman, late Professor of History and Political Economy in Brown University.

**SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.**—*Pre-historic Europe*, a Geological

Sketch, by James Geikie; *Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects*, by H. Helmholtz, translated by E. Atkinson; *The Cat*, introduction to the study of back-boned animals, especially mammals, by St. George Mivart; *The Origin of Nations*, by G. Rawlinson; *Relations of Science and Religion*, the Morse Lectures, 1880, connected with the Union Theological Seminary, by H. Calderwood; *The History of a Mountain*, by Elisée Reclus, translated from the French by Bertha Ness and J. Lillie; *Our Native Ferns and How to Study Them*, with synoptical description of the N. American species, by Lucien M. Underwood.

**HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.**—*Sir William Hamilton*, by W. H. S. Monck; *Leaders of Men*, a book of biographies specially written for boys, by H. A. Page; *Life and Education of Laura Dewey Bridgman*, the deaf, dumb and blind girl, new edition, by Mary Swift Lamson; *History of Greek Sculpture*, from the earliest times down to the age of Phidias, by A. S. Murray; *Political Eloquence in Greece—Demosthenes*—with Extracts from his Orations, and a critical discussion of the “Trial on the Crown,” by L. Brédif.

**MISCELLANEOUS.**—*Literary Art*, a Conversation between a Poet, Painter, and Philosopher, by J. Albee; *Dhammadāpa*, Collection of Verses, being one of the Canonical books of the Buddhists, translated from the Pali, by F. Max Müller—also the *Sutta-nipata*, Collection of Verses, being one of the Canonical books of the Buddhists, translated from the Pali by V. Fausboll, (Sacred Books of the East, edited by F. Max Müller); *Origin of Primitive Superstitions*, and their development into the worship of spirits and the doctrine of spiritual agency among the aborigines of America, by M. Rushton Dorman; *Rabbi Jeshua*, an Eastern Story, another reconstruction of the life of Christ, stripping it of all supernatural features; *Co-operation as a Business*, by C. Bernard; *The Human Voice and Connected Parts*, practical Book for Orators, Clergymen, Vocalists and others, by Geo. T. Ferris; *Literary Style*, and other Essays, by W. Mathews.



## ARTICLE IX.

### NOTICE OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ANDREAS DEICHERT, ERLANGEN, GERMANY.

*Der Zustand des Christen nach dem Tode. Drei Predigten von Pfarrer C.-R. Dr. Aug. Ebrard.* pp. 32. 1879.

Dr. and Consistorial-Rath Ebrard is one of the most voluminous and versatile writers of the German Church and with all a very able preacher. This little brochure contains three of his sermons devoted to that most interesting and difficult theme, “The State of the Christian after Death.” Profound and speculative as the subject is, Dr. E. treats it in a popular

form and in a most attractive manner, and we do not wonder that those who listened to their delivery asked for their publication. Like nearly all the eminent theologians of Germany Ebrard holds to Millenarian views and accordingly divides the Christian's state after death into three periods: 1. From Death to the resurrection of the Just. 2. From the Second Coming of Christ and through His glorious reign upon earth to the judgment. 3. In the New Heaven and the New Earth.

The blessed will not be resting in idleness in either of these periods. Knowledge will progress and deepen, and the soul, elevated to the vision of God, will gaze upon His works, and what it could here only view through a glass darkly, it will then behold face to face.

Even during the intermediate and disembodied condition, redeemed spirits will not be inactive but will take part in the promotion of the kingdom of Christ on earth, and when that is gloriously established through the Parousia of the Lord, they will direct their activity toward those who yet remain unconverted. "They shall be priests of God and of Christ," Rev. 20:6, leading sinful men to a knowledge of their guilt, counteracting the delusions and forces of evil, and with power proclaiming the grace and gospel of God until the song of triumph resounds: The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

But even in the New Heaven the redeemed will have occasion for activity. Millions and millions of souls have in this life no knowledge of Christ and no possible opportunity of believing in Him, yet there is no other name by which men are to be saved. "Shall not these have an opportunity given to them to believe and to be converted in the future world? The Scriptures all over its thousand pages give no answer to this question. It is only on the very last page that we find a single little word which glistens like a pearl, aye like a tear of joy. There where the incomparable glory of the New Heaven and the New Earth is described, we read of a river of water of life and of a tree of life with its fruits throughout the entire year, and there it is said 'the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations.' Healing! The dead cannot be healed and those that are whole need no healing. Hence after the final judgment, besides those that are whole and those that under the power of eternal death, there will be ailing ones in the New Heaven and the New Earth, sick or infirm ones who are to be healed and restored."

*Das Gebet des Herrn aus der Zeit und für die Zeit ausgelegt von E. Haffner, Pfarrer in Untermagerbein.* pp. 51. 1880.

Were all the other evidences of the divine origin of Christianity to fail, the prayer given by our Lord would alone be sufficient to seal its supernatural character. Penetrating the innermost recesses of consciousness, embracing every want that human nature has ever experienced and revealing the absolute perfections of God as well as His relation to His dependent creatures, as long as there is any language to express this prayer and

any hearts to offer it, Christianity must remain a living power upon the earth. With its daily repetition by Christian people for nearly two thousand years, and with all the learned volumes which have during these ages expounded and expanded its several petitions, every new study of it opens up fountains of truth as fresh and as original as the most recent discovery in hitherto unexplored realms of science.

This little volume is therefore not superfluous in its design, and it is certainly not fruitless in its results. Its readers, be they theologians or laymen, will not lay it down without feeling enriched in their understanding of the range, depth and fulness of this incomparable and inspired prayer. As the title indicates, it is meant to be especially and practically adapted to the present situation of both State and Church in Germany, but as much of the modern thought and tendency of the Empire is reflected in our own country, these pages are not without peculiar interest to Americans.

In profound submission to the truths of the Gospel, Pfarrer Haffner is the pupil of Hofman, and in the art of throwing the light of Scripture into the life of the present, he follows Beck, the great "Bibel-theolog" of this age. From his models and masters one may form a fair estimate of his production.

BROBST, DIEHL & CO., ALLENTOWN, PA.

*Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg, Patriarch der Lutherischen Kirche Nord America's, Selbstbiographie 1711-1743.* With portrait. pp. 256. 1881.

A highly interesting and most valuable contribution to the historical literature of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. It is an Autobiography of the illustrious founder of this denomination in our country covering the period of his earlier years and training, the voyage to America, and the first year of his activity among the dispersed and the distressed emigrants from the Fatherland.

The Autobiography proper, which occupies the larger portion of the volume, and which Muhlenberg over his name gives as "extracted from his manuscripts," bears the date, Providence, 1782. It was discovered among the missionary archives of the Franckean Institute at Halle, and is edited by Lic. Dr. W. German, Lutheran Pastor in Windsheim, Bavaria, who gives a short continuation of the biography gathered by him from the diaries of Muhlenberg, in 1742, '43, with an appendix of valuable notes and explanations. There is also a very full alphabetical index. The Work is issued in America in connection with the new edition that is about to appear, of the "Hallische Nachrichten," under the editorial supervision of Revs. W. J. Mann, D. D., and B. M. Schmucker, D. D.

Aside from all the ecclesiastical or religious interest one may feel in the wonderful endowments and providential equipment of this Patriarch of American Lutheranism, these pages possess the charm of adventure and romance that must give to them great popularity among German readers, but read by Lutherans, and especially by Lutheran ministers, they have a most practical as well as a historical interest and are worthy of the widest

circulation. The book sets before our eyes the wisdom and the far-reaching purpose of God in bringing to this new world a man so preëminently fitted for the peculiar work that was required to be done here at that time, namely the organization, independent of all control by the State, of a Church whose mission and whose glory is the preaching of a pure gospel.

The Lutheran Church in this country has still great discouragements, and serious obstacles obstruct its true progress, but the appearance upon our shores in the middle of the last century, of such a man as Muhlenberg, means unmistakably that God in this vast land proposes to do great things through the instrumentality of the Church to which he gave a Muhlenberg in America as truly as He gave to it a Luther in Germany. And such devotion to the cause and such wisdom in prosecuting it as marked the whole career of this apostle of Lutheranism, imitated and followed to-day all over this great land, would in a short period make the Church of Muhlenberg as strong and as influential in every western State as it is to-day in his adopted State of Pennsylvania.

The little volume is but the beginning of a series which when completed will make a most worthy biography of one of the noblest and best men on the illustrious roll of God's servants. And it will serve no doubt in a large measure to inspire the Church he organized with his own missionary zeal, activity and wisdom of organization.

An English translation of the entire work and of the "Hallische Nachrichten" of which it forms a part, is we are glad to learn already under way, and that, if we mistake not, in the competent hands of Rev. C. W. Schaeffer, D. D.

*Nachrichten von den vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch Lutherischen Gemeinen in Nord America, &c., Erster Band.—I. Heft.* pp. 96. 1881.

This is Part I. of vol. I. of the new edition of the "Hallische Nachrichten" above alluded to, published with historical explanations and original material derived immediately from the archives of the Franckean Institute at Halle, under the editorial supervision of Rev. Dr. W. J. Mann, and Rev. Dr. B. M. Schmucker with the coöperation of Dr. W. German, Evangelical Lutheran Pastor, at Windsheim, Bavaria, who has for years enjoyed special privileges in the examination of the Hallean Archives. We regard this as a most noble and praiseworthy undertaking, the largest ever attempted under Lutheran auspices in this country, and we are glad to see it in the hands of such scholars, whose names are a guarantee of the historic fidelity and thoroughness of the work as well as of the literary taste and tact which characterize and adorn it. One of them being exclusively German, another German-American, the third a native American, they constitute an editorial trio which together represent all the interests that are involved in this great enterprise.

This Part I. of the first volume clearly illustrates the general scope and historic value of the whole Work and its immense superiority over the old

edition of the "Nachrichten." It opens with Dr. Shulzes' preface to the original issue which is succeeded by explanatory notes elucidating every point referred to in the preface. Then follows the "*Kurtze Nachricht von einigen Evangelischen Gemeinen in America*," which occupies fifteen pages and to the various items in this report are devoted twenty-eight pages of the most interesting historical references and explanations gathered by the editors from all the accessible sources in German, English or American Libraries. After this comes the "Anhang Zur (ersten) Kurtzen Nachricht," an appendix to the first report, covering twenty pages, furnishing the most valuable original matter copied directly from the Hallean Archives. Both in the compass and in the plan of the work as well as in the prodigious labor which it involves, it may be compared to Gieseles's grand Church History, so rich and so satisfactory in its references to and extracts from original sources.

It must prove a heavy draft on the time of the editors as well as on the purse of the publishers. We predict that they will not repent of their investment. Surely every intelligent descendant of those early German colonists who has not lost the language or the faith of his worthy ancestors will want to read this thrilling story of their trials, their noble virtues, their fidelity to the cause of freedom and their fervent devotion to the Church.

AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, PHILADELPHIA.

8 AND 10 BIBLE HOUSE, ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK.

*A Dictionary of the Bible.* Including Biography, Natural History, Geography, Topography, Archaeology, and Literature. Edited by Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 958.

For compass of Biblical scholarship Dr. Schaff has no superior. This distinguished Swiss-German-American Theologian, with his many years of studious research, his numerous contributions to Biblical and Historical Science, and the wonderful versatility of his pen, possesses by general acknowledgment preëminent fitness for furnishing the American Sunday School Union with a Standard Bible Dictionary.

True, the whole of it is not the work of his own hands, but the valuable services which others have given to it, and which are respectfully acknowledged and vouched for by the editor, were mainly done under his immediate direction and in his own library. Those who coöperated with him in the departments of Natural History, Geography, &c., are men of special attainments in those branches and their names are a guarantee for accuracy and thoroughness. The work is for popular use yet none the less is it a treasure house of "the condensed results of the most recent investigations in biblical literature, history, biography, geography, topography, and archaeology." It is thus at once a valuable handbook for students, preachers and professors, as well as a most important aid to the complete understanding of the Scriptures in the home circle and in the Sunday School.

There are over four hundred illustrations, some of unusual merit; twenty-three maps not colored and twelve full-paged colored maps, the latter prepared and engraved specially for this work by the Messrs. Johnston of Edinburgh, Scotland, covering every period of Bible history from the time of the flood and including every locality that is named in the sacred records.

As Dr. Schaff has made an extensive tour over "Bible Lands," the description of localities has in many instances the advantage of being at first hand and from personal and careful observation.

We regard the whole as a very complete and very satisfactory "Dictionary of the Bible." It does not pretend to be a rival to the great ponderous cyclopaedias of Smith, Kitto or McClintock & Strong. It fills a different sphere, yet on many of the more important subjects, though briefer in form, it is as full and exhaustive in matter as either of those large and bulky works. Note for instance the article on Jerusalem. It covers twenty-four two-column pages and treats of i. *Names.* ii. *Situation and Extent.* iii. *Physical features*, including Elevations and Climate. iv. History divided into 1; The Jebusite Period. 2; Under the Kings. 3; Under Ezra and the Ptolemies. 4; In N. T. times. 5; Under Roman and Christian Emperors. 6; Under the Crusaders and the Turks. v. Topography, including the different walls and the most famous historic sites, various plans of the city maintained by the highest authorities. vi. Modern Jerusalem, with environs, buildings, distances, tombs, inhabitants, religion, the whole concluded by an exhaustive exhibit of the literature which may be consulted on the subject.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO, ILL.

*Political Eloquence in Greece.* DEMOSTHENES; with Extracts from his Orations, and a Critical Discussion of the "Trial on the Crown." By L. Brédif, former member of the Superior Normal School of France, Doctor in the Faculty of Letters at Paris, Professor in the Faculty of Letters at Toulouse, Rector of the Chambery Academy, University of France, etc. Translated by J. MacMahon, A. M. pp. 510. 1881.

The writer, the translator and the publishers have all combined to make this an excellent book. After an extended introduction on the three ages of Attic eloquence, a chapter is devoted to Philip of Macedon and the Athenians, and then Demosthenes is considered as the man, the citizen, and the statesman. Two chapters are next devoted to an analysis of the principal elements and characteristics of Demosthenes' eloquence, and then follow portrayals of oratorical contests in political debates at Athens, invective in Greek eloquence, and Greek eloquence in the light of truth and morality. In the tenth chapter are found discussions on Demosthenes as a moralist, the relations of justice and politics, and religious sentiment in Demosthenes. Then follows a chapter on "The Trial on the Crown,"

which will be of special interest to all who have read *Demosthenes de Corona*.

In the chapter on "Philip—the Athenians," the writer vividly presents to the reader the crafty, ambitious, skillful and energetic enemy of Greece, and the pleasure-loving, ease-taking, news-telling and hard-to-be-awakened character of the Athenians. Thus will be more clearly seen the difficulties in the way of Demosthenes in arousing his fellow-citizens to resistance, and what must have been the power of his eloquence in view of what followed his calls to arms. Professor Brédif cautiously guards against the disposition of writers to become over-zealous and unduly magnify their subject, and strives, while ascribing to Demosthenes what is due, to do nothing more.

His presentation of Demosthenes as a man, a citizen, and a statesman, is appreciative and discriminating. The analysis of the elements and characteristics of his eloquence is full, and evinces a thorough acquaintance with his speeches and the circumstances under which they were delivered. Indeed, there is manifest throughout the whole work a familiar knowledge of the subject in hand and Grecian literature in general, and he draws at pleasure from its rich stores for illustration and comparison. We are taken into Athens and made acquainted with the populace and leading actors in those turbulent times; we witness the oratorical contests in the political debates; we grow indignant at the schemes and false charges of the wily and bitter Æschines; we hear Demosthenes and witness the influence of his burning eloquence upon the people; and we are brought into sympathy with his plans for protecting the Athenians and resisting the march of the invader. The ardent French heart of the author is perceived through all the pages of the book, and his spirited style seems to have lost nothing in the excellent translation by Mr. MacMahon. In the extended discussion of "The Trial on the Crown," there is a striking picture of the two great competitors or rather adversaries, Demosthenes and Æschines, their points of strength and weakness, their attachment to country, their purposes and acts, their rise and fall. The concluding chapter takes a view of the political, moral and literary condition of Athens in the time of Demosthenes, running an analogy for awhile between that epoch and the period of the French revolution.

*Literary Style, and Other Essays.* By William Mathews, LL. D., author of "Getting on in the World," "Words; their Use and Abuse," "Oratory and Orators," etc., etc. pp. 345. 1881.

A volume from the pen of Prof. Mathews needs but be announced, to secure readers. The high reputation gained for him by his first book has been sustained and widened by his successive works. What he himself says of the value of style, in one of these essays, could hardly be better illustrated than in the success and popularity of his own productions. For, whatever may be said of the matter of Prof. Mathew's writings, the

racy and brilliant style in which every thought is set, a style full of bright imagery and striking antitheses, makes them suggestive and quickening reading.

This book, taking its name from the first essay, is made up of twenty-one papers on different subjects, such as—after the first—the Duty of Praise, Periodical Literature, The Blues and their Remedy, the Modesty of Genius, Sensitiveness to Criticism, the Ideal and the Real, Fat vs. Lean, Fools, Angling, a Plea for the Erring, Hot-House Education, Office-seeking, &c. They are entertaining papers, abounding in important truths and valuable lessons. Sometimes the author's fondness for telling antithesis runs into sensational and untenable statements, as for instance, when, describing "good people's" freedom from temptation, he asserts the explanation: "Not because they are above but because they are beneath temptation." Indeed, his whole picture, which unites goodness with stupidity and dullness incapable of discerning or feeling the charms of "forbidden fruit," and combines high intellectuality with rampant vice, needs revising. But the book cannot fail to be popular and useful.

ROBERT CARTER & BROS., NEW YORK.

*The Palace Beautiful or Sermons to Children.* By Wm. Wilberforce Newton, author of "Little and Wise," "The Wicket-Gate," and "The Interpreter's House." pp. 348. 1881.

This book, which derives its title from the "Palace Beautiful" in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," consists of a collection of Sermons for children. Among the topics which designate the different discourses are "Tests," "Fast Driving," "Small Beginnings," "Early Planting," &c.

We welcome all efforts of this kind which give healthy instruction to our little ones, deeming it a most lamentable misfortune that nearly all our juvenile literature is in the form of stories, and that these have so vitiated the taste of our young people that they have no relish for truth unless it is disguised under an exciting and sensational romance.

It is this very fact that makes it in our day difficult to preach to children or to publish sermons which they will delight to read, and there are not many preachers or authors who excel in this most important sphere. Mr. Newton has in this volume, as in those which have preceded it, "Little and Wise," "The Wicket-Gate," &c., done well, and he bids fair to equal in this line his distinguished father, yet all along one wishes that he might have done better. Analogies from nature and every day experience abound, and the symbolism derived from the "Pilgrim's Progress" and similar publications forms a beautiful woof, but there is danger of over-doing this feature, and too often we have a maximum of illustration with a minimum of truth. It is important to place the seed where the lambs can reach it, but they may not enjoy having it actually thrust into the mouth. However, the analogies are always in themselves instructive and interesting, and if it is designed to give the children other information as

well as the holy truths of the Gospel, these numerous and varied illustrations will serve that purpose very well. In the sermon on "The Palace Beautiful," which the author interprets as signifying the Christian Church, and in which he speaks of its gates being open for the little ones, and of "the place which childhood has in the Church," we certainly expected a reference to Baptism and its blessed significance to children as the initiatory sacrament of grace. This omission by a Paedo-baptist minister is to us inexplicable. In this connection it could not have been passed by but with deliberate intent and pains to avoid it. Instead of any attempt to explain this as the real gate into the Church, we have only such glittering generalities as "the little foot-prints of the children who keep pressing into the Christian Church," "the little gate—the beautiful gate of the temple—is the welcome which Jesus gives to the children."

*Electa.* By Mrs. Nathaniel Conklin (Jennie M. Drinkwater), Author of "Tessa Wadsworth's Discipline," "Rue's Helps," &c. pp. 339. 1881.

Electa is the principal character of this religious story, the scene of which is laid in America. She is the daughter of a minister, who has the proverbial heritage of a large family, numbering in this instance a baker's dozen. Her character seems at first quite unlovable and several of the early chapters are lacking in interest, but as she advances in life she becomes a lovely, useful, Christian woman, and the narrative grows correspondingly in interest. Treating of every-day life and of every-day people in a chaste and dignified style and with fine descriptive powers, readers of the home circle and of the Sunday School will find in it many forcible and wholesome lessons.

*Duties and Duties.* A Tale. By Agnes Giberne, author of "Sun, Moon and Stars," "Muriel Bertram," "Aimee," &c. pp. 361. 1881.

The heroine of this story, Annis Dermot, is a character. She serves as a faithful mirror of certain questionable Christians, especially of the female sex, who it is to be hoped will carefully survey in her the reflection of their own distorted Christianity. With a morbid zeal to do mission work among the poor, she combines a selfish disposition and a disagreeable and hateful temper at home, apparently intent upon making those of her own household as miserable as she was laboring to render those outside of her home comfortable and happy. Her sisters who make no pretense of godliness and who in her estimation are supremely "worldly," exhibit far more of Christian sweetness of temper, self-denial and devotion to each other's well-being than this pious missionary among the destitute.

It was in fact clearly the gentle influence of these "worldly" sisters, whom she was unable by her repulsive methods to convert to the Saviour, that finally brought a change over her own spirit, convinced her of her mistaken course of duty and transformed her nature into a fitter and fuller representative of Christian principle.

*Leaders of Men.* A book of biographies specially written for youth. By H. A. Page. pp. 398. 1881.

Biographies furnish the very best reading matter for our boys. Still there are different qualities, determined both by the subjects treated and by the style and skill of the author. The subjects in this work selected from the roll of renown, embrace some of the most famous, most remarkable and most worthy men of modern times, and represent a variety both of character and of successful pursuits in which they respectively achieved their greatness.

The noble Prince Albert, the late Consort of England's Queen, appropriately heads the list, followed by such worthies as Robert Dick, Baker and Geologist; Commodore Goodenough, Lord Lawrence, Dr. John Wilson, Dr. Andrew Reed, &c.

In the presentation and delineation of these different characters, the author is as happy as he was judicious in the selection of their names. He is a clear and strong writer.

Good boys will read these biographies with interest and delight, and learn from them some most wholesome lessons, while those of larger growth will not be disappointed by looking into them for either entertainment or information.

*Wise Words and Loving Deeds:* A book of biographies for girls. By E. Conder Gray. pp. 415. 1881.

Written by a different author and probably without any knowledge of the "Leaders of Men" just noticed, these biographies form in fact a companion volume to that work, this being adapted to girls as that is designed for boys. The subjects here are women of renown owing their distinction and their attraction primarily to the purity and force of their Christian character. The list is made up of such names as "Mary Somerville," "Charlotte Elliott," "Madame Feller," "Baroness Bunsen," "Catherine Tait," and "Maria Louisa Charlesworth," who wrote "Ministering Children," a book whose circulation has reached the marvellous number of hundreds of thousands.

*The Relations of Science and Religion.* The Morse Lecture, 1880, connected with Union Theological Seminary, New York. By Henry Calderwood, LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. Author of "Relations of Mind and Brain," etc.

Dr. Calderwood has an acknowledged place among the first scholars and thinkers of our day. His various works, from the "Philosophy of the Infinite," on to the present volume, form an aggregate contribution to philosophical science of great and permanent value. His vigorous and clear intellect throws strong and safe light upon every subject to which he gives his masterful handling. No better man could have been chosen to deliver the Morse Lectures here given. The author's own statement, in

the Preface, of the design and discussion, is so clear and condensed that we can do no better than to quote it:

"The aim of the present volume is to indicate the measure of harmony traceable between recent advances in science, and the fundamental characteristics of religious thought, and the extent to which harmony is possible. This attempt has been made in the hope of contributing towards a better understanding of the relative positions of scientists and theologians, thereby aiding the formation of public opinion on questions appearing to involve serious antagonism.

The plan followed is to bring under review the great fields of scientific inquiry, advancing from unorganized existence to Man; to present the most recent results of research in these separate fields, without extending to minute details; as far as possible, to allow scientific observers to state results in their own words; and then to examine carefully the reasonings deduced from ascertained facts, and the bearing of facts and inferences on religious thought.

The general result is that marked modifications of thought concerning the structure and order of the universe have arisen on account of scientific discoveries, to be accepted by theologians, as by all thinkers; that the bearing of these modifications on religious conceptions has been greatly mistaken by many scientific observers; and that it must be held clear by scientists and theologians alike, that while scientific methods are reliable within their own spheres, science can bear no testimony, and can offer no criticism, as to the supernatural, inasmuch as science is only an explanation of ascertained facts by recognition of natural law. In accordance with this last statement, it is maintained, that science does not reach, far less deal with, the problem concerning the origin of Nature, the solution of which can be found only by transcending Nature, that is, by recognizing the supernatural."

The discussion displays throughout a familiar and thorough mastery of the latest discoveries and thought in philosophical science, and of all the principles that must determine the various problems involved in connection with Christianity. The salient points of the subject are strongly grasped, and the examination is conducted in a calm and judicial temper. The book is one of the most valuable of the important class to which it belongs, and will serve at once both the interests of science and the cause of Christian truth.

#### LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

*Book of Worship, with Tunes.* Published by the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States. pp. 559. 1881.

This book, which had been long looked for has been now some months in use in the churches. It has received a cordial welcome, and we believe its use is justifying the judgment and taste of the committee of compilers. The tunes are found to be mainly such as have sustained themselves as the best, and vindicated for themselves a permanent place in the services

of the sanctuary. They have been selected in most excellent adaptation of the music to the spirit of the hymns. A large part of the work of compilation has been done by Mr. Remsberg, who gave it long and laborious attention. With the completing work of the other members of the Committee, a Hymnal has been given to our Church with merits unsurpassed by any hymnal of any of the churches.

It is very much to be regretted that while the work as a hymnal is thus so excellent, the morning and evening services appear in it in altered form. No explanation of this has been given. It is not necessary to determine where the responsibility rests for this unfortunate change. It is enough to know that it was not only unauthorized, but is in violation of the unquestionable idea on which the General Synod meant the Hymnal to be prepared—that no change was to be made, as to hymns or otherwise, that would interfere with the concurrent use of the Tune book and the Book of Worship, or at all impair the value of the Book of Worship which was just fairly introduced, at much cost, into the churches. No question need be raised as to whether the alteration presents better forms of service—though even on that score the answer could hardly be doubtful, at least as to the morning service. It is enough to recall the fact that no change in these forms was intended by the action of the General Synod ordering the preparation and publication of the Hymnal. If it be claimed that the preparation of a modified form by the *Liturgical* committee seemed to call for a transfer of it to the Book of Worship, it is sufficient, in reply, to point out the fact that, still, no authority was given to any committee or any man to make such a transfer. The General Synod alone could say whether the forms from the Liturgy should supersede those which it had itself formally adopted for the Book of Worship at the meeting in Washington. To make the transfer in the face of the General Synod's care to have the Book of Worship unimpaired, seems to us an unwarrantable assumption of authority somewhere, incapable of justification. The effect of it must be to greatly lessen the value of the Hymnal if the Book of Worship keeps its place, or to destroy the value of the Book of Worship if the Hymnal supersedes it. It may be safely assumed that the General Synod would not have been persuaded to believe that the form of service given would be a compensation for the confusion and damage involved in substituting it.

*Life Thoughts for Young Men.* By M. Rhodes, D. D., Pastor of St. Mark's English Evangelical Lutheran Church, St. Louis, Mo. Second Edition. pp. 340. 1881.

*Recognition in Heaven.* By M. Rhodes, D. D., author of "Life Thoughts for Young Men," etc. 1881.

That a second edition of Dr. Rhodes' "Life Thoughts" has been already called for is high testimony to the book. In these days of multitudinous books of this kind, such a success is peculiarly gratifying. We take

pleasure in commending this new edition, as we did the first. Renewed attention is also called to the little volume on the subject of the heavenly recognition, of which favorable notice was given some time ago.

*The Wine Miracle* in relation to the present aspect of the Temperance Reform. By Rev. J. F. Diener, Catawissa, Pa. pp. 47. 1881.

According to Jno. II., the miracle of Christ at Cana, consisted in His making wine out of water. According to this author it consisted in His not making wine. We are thus left to choose between two miracles. Probably the third and greatest miracle is that intelligent and honest men can so falsify the Scriptures.

W.

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*The Legend of Thomas Didymus, the Jewish Skeptic.* By James Freeman Clarke, author of "The Great Religions," "Self-Culture," etc. pp. 448. 1881.

The object of this book is to furnish a re-statement of the life of Jesus in accordance with what Dr. Clark believes to be the requirements of present thought. He has not been satisfied with any of the numerous efforts to reconstruct that life, and presents this as giving "another view of Jesus which differs somewhat from them all." The delineation is thrown into the form of a legend, in which Thomas, called Didymus, is represented as writing out, for those who come after him, a memorial of the life and times of the Saviour.

It must be admitted that Dr. Clarke has produced an interesting volume, abounding in fine sentiment and some beautiful delineations. It is confused all through with the coloring with which a gifted imagination can mislead the feelings and the judgment. But he presents an impossible picture, incapable of being soberly accepted as real or genuine. The intensely real person, the Jesus of the evangelists, disappears in an unrecognizable, shadowy, nondescript figure, incapable of being either understood or believed in. The author's way of dealing with the New Testament histories is thoroughly rationalistic. Their plain and uniform statements are no barrier to contrary opinions. The supernatural is eliminated by the most forced interpretations. Everything supernatural disappears from such miracles as the stilling of the tempest, the cursing of the fig tree, the piece of money in the fish's mouth, the feeding of the five thousand, &c. As a specimen of his method, an extract from the account of the last will suffice: "The prayer was so heavenly, that all my hunger went away; and tears were falling from many eyes. The people took little morsels from his hands, and tasted, and gave it quickly to their neighbors. I saw many who had concealed their food to keep it for their own use; and they also brought it forward to be blessed, and gave it speedily to each other. Thus, as he continued to speak, we all sat in heavenly places, and ate the food of angels, each caring for others more than for himself. When all

had eaten, Jesus told us to gather up the fragments which remained, that nothing be lost; for He always taught us to reverence the gifts of God. He said that, as we would not throw away carelessly the wooden toy which a friend had carved for us with much pains, so we ought not heedlessly to squander and waste what the infinite Father had wisely and carefully made for us. Thus we gathered up the fragments, and they filled twelve baskets; and men said it was a mighty work of power, which had caused a few loaves to grow into a great number. I, too, thought it a mighty and wonderful work; but I thought it was not done to the bread, but to the souls of the men, by creating pity for each other, and making them glad to bestow on others whatever they had."

Dr. Clarke says in the preface: "Some will consider the portrait of Jesus in this work too purely human and natural, others as too supernatural." It is difficult to see how anything but utter infidelity could see too much of the supernatural in it, when all that is left of the miraculous seems reduced to the simply marvellous or inexplicable. The incongruities and absurdities into which the author is forced are a painful exhibition of the straits into which men are always driven in the effort to keep Christianity while rejecting its supernatural facts. Dr. Clarke's book simply adds another to the number of failures in this effort.

*Handbook of English Synonyms*, with an Appendix showing the correct use of Prepositions. Also a Collection of Foreign Phrases. By L. J. Campbell. pp. 160. 1881.

This is an excellent little book which young writers, especially, will find very useful, if kept on their table convenient for reference. It will not only help them to get the right word in the right place, but to vary the right word in the interest of good rhetoric. It contains about forty thousand words.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*Memoirs of Prince Metternich, 1815-1829*. Edited by Prince Richard Metternich. The papers classified and arranged by M. A. de Klinkoström. Translated by Mrs. Alexander Napier. Volumes III. and IV. pp. 674 and 642. 1881.

The first and second volumes of these memoirs, which appeared some time since, excited a deep and general interest, and hence the third and fourth volumes, which complete them, have received a special welcome. They, however, reveal very few additional points as to the character of Prince Metternich, either as a man or diplomat. But many points receive confirmation, and the inner mind of the man on scores of subjects is revealed to us as in a mirror.

These memoirs show that Metternich's estimate of his own merits was anything but modest. He belonged to the "happy egotists," who always

regard their own views and actions as correct, who understand matters thoroughly, and are ready to enlighten the world in general on any subject that may arise. He was an exception to the rule that great men are modest as to their worth, for great he was, without a doubt. His unbounded conceit, however, will be found quite entertaining, if the reader can overcome his contempt for such a spirit.

There is much to indicate that he was a man of little feeling, and there seems to have been some ground for the prevalent charge that he had no heart. He himself knew of this popular impression and regarded it unjust. And it is true that, in domestic affliction, he was deeply touched, an instance of which appears in the illness and death of his young daughter, Clementine. During her sickness he says: "I am still thoroughly miserable. \* \* I go from my writing-table to the sick bed, and back again. If my heart is restless, so are also my nights, which never happens to me when my head only is in question: a proof of what a quite different power the heart has—just that heart which is denied me by the crowd." And he confesses that, after her death, he could not enter her room without tears. If he was cold and harsh in public life, he seems to have been tender enough in his own household.

Metternich had no sympathy with Bible Societies, and was a true Romanist in opposing the circulation of the Scriptures among the masses. But he himself read them and venerated them. He says, "I read every day one or two chapters of the Bible: I discover new beauties daily, and I prostrate myself before this admirable book." And again, "For myself, I read only Luther's translation, the best which has ever been made in any country, and in a living language." Coming, as this does, from a distinguished Romanist, it deserves some notice.

Most of the letters, dispatches and papers refer to public matters and reveal the sagacity and knowledge of Metternich as a diplomatist and statesman. The time extends from 1815 to 1829, and refers to the great political events of Europe during that period. Some of these are the internal affairs of the Austrian Empire, the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, the Congress at Carlsbad and Vienna, and later, of Laybach and Verona, and the complications arising from the Russian advance upon Turkey. In these and the other great political events of that period, Metternich either took part as a prominent actor, or gave his views in reference to them; and whilst the general reader may find his interest attaching to the man, the state papers, dispatches, etc., will constitute a good book of reference for the student of politics, the historian, and the diplomate.

But whether we look upon Metternich as a man or a diplomatist, there are so many different phases of character presented, so many striking assertions made, such bold and self-confident claims of superiority over others, and views expressed on such a wide range of topics, personal and political, that the volumes are likely to prove, in most points, interesting to every intelligent reader.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN &amp; CO., BOSTON.

*A Talmudic Miscellany*, or a Thousand and One Extracts from the Talmud, the Midrashim and the Kabbalah. Compiled and Translated by Paul Isaac Hershon, Author of "Genesis according to the Talmud," "Extracts from the Talmud," etc. With Introductory Preface by the Rev. F. W. Farar, D. D., F. R. S., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty, and Canon of Westminster. With Notes and Copious Indexes. pp. 361. 1880.

This volume meets a real need. To most clergymen the Talmud is something almost wholly unknown. Locked up in its original Hebrew, of such vast bulk and miscellaneous character as thus far to have prevented translation, it has been practically inaccessible to all but a few scholars. The ordinary minister has had to be content with the little that books have told about the character of this great collection of Rabbinical lore. From descriptions and stray quotations here and there he could only imagine what sort of work it was. We greet with pleasure, therefore, this work of Mr. Hershon, which brings to us, in addition to a good brief description of the Talmud, a collection of extracts which are representative of it all—specimens of it exactly as we would see if we, ourselves, with a knowledge of Talmudic Hebrew, dipped haphazard into its voluminous pages to find out for ourselves the nature of its contents. Mr. Hershon has been fitted for the task he has here accomplished by his life-long familiarity with Talmudic literature; and the accuracy and impartiality of his work are assured to us by the favorable judgment of competent scholars—Dr. Delitzsch among others. The minister or student will therefore have here a chance to understand it, in passages that illustrate it in both its gems and its trash, its richness and its poverty. He will be instructed in every way. He will see the immense superiority of the living oracles of God. At the same time he will find many side-lights for the interpretation of both the Old Testament and the New.

The work has been gotten out by the publishers in excellent style, pleasant to the eye, and convenient for reference. Two good indexes are given, one of the Scripture passages quoted or alluded to, and the other of the subjects in the Talmudic extracts.

## T. WHITTAKER, NEW YORK.

*Individualism: Its Growth and Tendencies*: with some suggestions as to the Remedy for its Evils. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in November, 1880. By Right Rev. A. N. Littlejohn, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Long Island. pp. 206. 1881.

In these days of growing disregard for law and order, when the claims of the Family, the State, and the Church are set at naught for the sake of personal satisfaction or gain; when these divinely ordained institutions are regarded as good only so far as they support and benefit the individual; and when this sentiment prevails to such an extent as to lead a man

even to justify himself in shooting down in broad daylight the President of our Republic, because, forsooth, he stands in the way of his faction or of himself in getting office, such a book as this of Bishop Littlejohn's, on "Individualism," is timely. The question too often is, not what can I do for my own household, my country and the Church, but what can these do for me, or how can I make them best subserve my own personal interests? It is a system of ethics that claims all rights and renders no duties.

Bishop Littlejohn, in these three sermons, discusses (1) The Growth and Tendencies of Individualism; (2) Counter Truths; (3) Institutional Checks and Limitations. In the early part of the first sermon he shows that, in the earliest stages of human society, there was no true idea of man *as man*. "The monarch owned the subject, the father the son, the husband the wife, the master the slave; and so absolute was the ownership that it excluded even the vaguest notion of the *jus naturale* of the individual, as we understand it." (p. 3) But there has been a change, and now the tendency is to go to the other extreme, make the individual supreme, and use the family, state and Church to minister to his wants and gratification. The author shows that Christianity gives man his proper place between these two extremes. While it raises him up from the first in which his individualism was lost, it throws limitations around him, puts him in proper relations to society, and shows him that, while he has rights that are due to himself, he also has duties which he owes to others.

This book will have a tendency to inculcate respect for law, government, good order in general, whether in the family, state or Church. The author has no sympathy with any looseness that will disregard the marriage or family ties, the rights of property, or that will lead to socialism, communism, nihilism in any shape. It is a vigorous discussion and quite worthy of its author.

PRINTING HOUSE OF THE JOINT SYNOD OF OHIO, COLUMBUS, O.

*Anti-Calvinism.* By Dr. August Pfeiffer, Superintendent at Luebeck in 1698. Translated from the German by Edward Pfeiffer. With an Introduction by Prof. M. Loy, A. M.

Dr. Pfeiffer, for some time professor of oriental languages at Wittenberg, was a distinguished scholar and an able writer. The work here translated was written not as a subtle scientific treatise, but as a popular discussion of Biblical doctrine as involved in the disputes between the Lutheran and Reformed churches. It was meant for the instruction of the people. It covers all the leading doctrines in the controversy: the proper use of Reason in questions of faith; God's relation to the human will in acts of sin; the communicatio-idiomatum; Christ's omnipresence according to His human nature; whether God sincerely wills all men to be saved; the universality of the atonement; the universal call of grace; eternal election; eternal reprobation; whether the grace of conversion is irresistible; the possibility of falling from grace; Baptism; the Lord's Supper, and eccl-

siastical ceremonies. The discussion is marked by great clearness and vigor, and a maintenance of the fullest and strictest type of the Lutheranism of the Form of Concord. But the appeal for the truth of each doctrine is made not to the Confession, but to the divine word. It will help to strengthen the reader's confidence in the teachings of our Church on the leading points on which the Reformed churches have held different views. The discussion is marked, however, by the rigid formalities of statement, definition, proof, comfort, &c., characteristic of the seventeenth century. This adds, indeed, to clearness, but becomes somewhat wearisome. It is shaped and colored, too, all through, by the special controversies of that period. It is questionable whether it is desirable to have the intense antagonisms which belonged to that time perpetuated in the Church of today, especially when the author's general method was to fix upon the opposite side the extremest opinions that could be found in any responsible writer. It is well known that in our day there has been considerable modification of many of the angular points of Calvinistic teaching. Some of Dr. Pfeiffer's arguments or proofs, moreover, are not nearly as good as the doctrines in support of which they are used. These are drawbacks to the usefulness of the book, though the intrinsic merits of the work as a discussion of the seventeenth century, give it a permanent value—a value in view of which we are glad to see this translation.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*Co-operation as a Business.* By Charles Barnard. pp. 234. 1881.

This book deals principally with the processes and benefits of *building associations*. It shows how these institutions are conducted, and in what way the weekly and monthly savings of the members may encourage thrift and economy, and be used for securing a home. The methods are minutely and clearly given by the author, who evidently understands them and heartily approves of them. We confess, however, that we cannot approve, as he does, of men paying from 12 to 18 per cent. premium on money borrowed, with the idea of gaining by it. Such a course, on the part of some, will be profitable only to those who allow their money to remain in the association as an investment. They are greatly benefited; but the greater their gain, the greater is the loss to the borrower. It is just this heedless borrowing at a high premium that has, in so many cases, thrown the new property into the hands of the association, and brought the whole system into bad odor in many communities. It can be harmless only when *all* pay a high premium for the money they borrow, for then the loss to the individuals is equalized and compensation for it is found in an equal sharing of the gain to the association. The author's figures are very plausible, but common sense will tell us that it is not good business policy to borrow \$200, pay interest on that amount, and weekly at that, and yet only receive \$165 or \$170.

But the best feature about these associations is the tendency they have to make men practice industry and economy. If a place be provided for the small savings and men decide to put them there, they will try to save as much as possible, and this will make them careful to avoid the little leaks, the useless and sometimes harmful expenditures, and thus lead to industry, sobriety, economy, and contribute to the good order and prosperity of the community. The following, from the author's prefatory note, we believe is true :

"Under the general name of 'co-operation,' the idea of association for mutual saving and earning has proved of more real use to the people than any system of economy yet proposed. It has built many hundred thousands homes, saved tens of thousands for people who really needed the help, it has taught more than a million people economy and fair dealing and has educated their children in prudence, thrift and self-respect. Moreover, it is beginning to have an influence upon trade and commerce that cannot fail to be of the greatest importance."

The whole book is full of information in regard to co-operative movements. We have specially referred to building associations, and they take up the main part of the work, in which the author gives in detail the systems pursued in Philadelphia, New York and England. Then he gives an account of co-operation in trade and manufactures, in life-insurance, in dispensaries, etc., etc.

The substance of these chapters originally appeared in *Scribner's Monthly*, the *New York Spectator* and *Independent*, and in a paper read by the author before the American Social Science Association, in 1877; but the whole has been recast and much new material added.

SEVERINGHAUS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Formel-Buch für deutsche Prediger und Gemeinden der General Synode, &c.*, 2te Auflage, pp. 100. 1881.

This Book of forms for the German preachers and congregations is neatly gotten up by the enterprising German publishers of the "Kirchenfreund." It claims the sanction of "The German Publication Board." Its contents are : I. Order of Worship for Morning and Evening ; II. Forms for Ministerial Acts, Baptism, Confirmation, &c.; III. The Congregation ; Formation of New Congregations, Calling a Pastor, &c.; IV. The Church, Church Government, &c.; V. The General Synod, its Constitution, &c.; VI. Sunday School Organization ; Teachers and Missionary Societies, &c.; VII. Mutual Aid Associations ; Sisterhoods, Brotherhoods, &c.

*In Memoriam.* To the Ohio Synodical Printing House we are indebted for a copy of the neat pamphlet containing a Memorial of the lamented Rev. Prof. W. F. Lehman, late President of Capital University, with the Addresses of Profs. Loy and Schmid at his funeral, Resolutions, &c. A striking Portrait of this departed worthy occupies the frontispiece.

*Jugend-Lieder.* A collection of favorite and most suitable hymns for Sunday Schools and other assemblies of Christian young people. The collection, which is on the whole a good one, was made at the instance of the German Publication Board of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Some of these are translated from the English. On what grounds the "Star Spangled Banner" and "Hail Columbia" are placed in a collection of sacred psalmody, we are not informed. There is an appendix containing eighteen of our most popular English hymns.

#### PAMPHLETS.

*The Homiletical Quarterly.* Jan. 7th, 1881. English Editor: Rev. J. S. Exel; American Editor: Rev. J. C. Caldwell, A. M. We have not been at all kindly disposed toward the ordinary "homiletical" journal. It has usually seemed but a help to laziness or a crutch to lameness. But we see a higher purpose and method in this Quarterly—the development of homiletical ability by quickening discussion of Biblical truths and themes, the suggestive aid of homiletical specimens, and whatever concerns the preacher's work of sermonizing. This object deserves to have an able Quarterly devoted to it, such as we are persuaded this is. The January number impresses us very favorably.

*Confirmation.* A Tract for Catechumens. By Rev. A. C. Whitmer, Third Thousand, Grant, Faires & Rodgers, Philadelphia. pp. 48. 1881. This tract professes to give the history and meaning of confirmation, and especially an explanation of the confirmation vows, and it does this in a clear, concise and interesting way. It is by one of the most intelligent and practical clergymen of the Reformed Church and deserves the wide circulation it is receiving in that denomination.

#### PERIODICALS.

The four Foreign Quarterlies, the *Edinburgh Review*, the *London Quarterly*, the *Westminster*, and the *British Quarterly*, with *Blackwood*, from the Leonard Scott Publishing Co., have been received, filled with able and valuable discussions.

Harper's *Magazine*, *Bazar*, *Weekly*, and *Young People*, have also come regularly to hand, and fully sustain their high reputation.